

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches* Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)

VOL. III.

October, 1938.

No. 4

THE BYZANTINE LITURGY

(continued).

THE INCOMPLETE LITURGY OF THE PRESANCTIFIED GIFTS.

I have already outlined the meaning of this rite and its probable origin and antiquity.

I. WHEN IS IT CELEBRATED?

It is necessary to distinguish between the ancient use and the modern custom. In the monasteries that followed the constitutions of Theodore the Studite, this liturgy was celebrated on every day during the Great Lent which was a strict fast: we know that in some places it was celebrated on Good Friday, and even on February 2nd and March 25th when they fell in Lent: and out of this season it was prescribed—chiefly in the monasteries—on Wednesdays and Fridays throughout the year, and on September 14th, all of which are days of strict fasting. Nowadays the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts is celebrated every Wednesday and Friday during the Great Lent from the week of the Tyrophagion (and in certain monasteries on Mondays also), on the Thursday of the Great Canon and on the first three days of Holy Week.

The Typikon (book of rubrics) of Constantinople notes that to celebrate a local feast it is necessary to follow the rite of the presanctified—however in practice, above all in the lesser churches, the custom has lately grown up of celebrating the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom on these days; and it is invariably used on the feasts of the Meeting (Hypapanti) and the Annunciation (February 2nd and March 25th): and for a long time now it has been abandoned on Good Friday.

2. HOW THE PRESANCTIFIED GIFTS ARE PREPARED.

On the Sunday, or a feast falling on Monday, are prepared as many 'Lambs' as there will be Masses of the Presanctified during the week. After the communion of the officiating

clergy, the priest or deacon lets fall some of the Precious Blood on each of these 'Lambs,' on the soft part of the bread. These morsels are then put in a box or pyx, and this is set aside in the cupboard or tabernacle used for Reservation. This receptacle may be placed on the altar of the prothesis, but more often it is set on the high altar, with the door of the tabernacle turned towards the east, that is to say towards the synthronon in the absidal, where is kept perpetually burning a lamp, called the Inextinguishable Light.

3. The rite of the Presanctified may be celebrated with or without a deacon; but it is usual, on the first two days of Lent and the three days of Holy Week, or on a great local feast, for a bishop with priests and deacons concelebrating to preside himself at the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts. The bishop may also on the occasion of this liturgy confer minor orders or the diaconate, but he cannot ordain a priest, because the rubrics demand that, at the conferring of the priesthood, the newly ordained shall perform the sacrifice, which is of course not possible in the case of an incomplete liturgy. It is always permissible for the faithful to receive Communion.

4. THE LITURGY OF THE PRESANCTIFIED CAN BE DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS

(1) Vespers.

(2) The Rite of the Presanctified.

(1) Vespers.

At the beginning of Vespers the priest and the deacon vest in all their robes and the blessing of these takes place as usual, but without the separate prayers for each one: the priest and deacon merely say 'Let us pray to the Lord.' The bishop remains on his throne until the Entrance.

(a) First doxology.

(b) Reading of the introductory psalm 103 by the bishop or the Superior and reading of the secret prayers by the priest.

(c) The great collect, read by the deacon.

(d) Reading of the gradual psalms in three parts, each followed by a little collect and accompanied by a secret prayer said by the priest who celebrates: these are the three antiphons corresponding to those of the complete liturgy.

(e) At the beginning of the reading of the psalms the priest and his deacon go up to the high altar where the tabernacle stands. The celebrant incenses it and prostrates three times, then takes the pyx containing the 'Lambs' and holding it upon his head, he proceeds to the altar of the prothesis: in front of him walks the deacon, holding a lighted candle and incensing the sacred species.

(f) Preparation of the presanctified gifts. One of the portions of the consecrated 'Lamb' is placed on the diskos. The wine and water are mixed in the chalice, the asterisk and veils are incensed, and the diskos and chalice are covered, as in the complete liturgy; but none of the words there used are pronounced as the actions are performed until the final formula "by the prayers of our holy fathers". After this the priest replaces the box containing the 'Lamb' in the tabernacle on the high altar. Sometimes, however, this may be done during the next part of the rite.

(g) Singing of psalms 140, 141, 129, 116—the last verses of these are interspersed with troparia.

(b) Entrance. At the singing of the last troparion, the entrance takes place as in the complete liturgy but the gospel is only carried on the days when it is directed to be read, that is to say on the feasts of saints and the first three days of Holy Week. When it is desired to make the ceremony more solemn, or whenever a bishop celebrates, several priests in their vestments take part in the entrance. When the vesper hymn (*phos hilaron*) which accompanies the entry of the celebrants has been sung, the bishop descends from his throne, with deacons on either side bearing the *dikerion* and the *trikerion*, and follows the priests who enter the sanctuary. He then goes to the *synthronon* and vests.

(i) Readings from Genesis, Proverbs and Job. A special ceremony takes place between the first and second readings—the priest or bishop if he is celebrating, takes in his right hand a lighted candle and the censer, and standing in front of the high altar he makes the sign of the cross with the candle crying "Wisdom: stand up" (*sophia—orthi*), then turning towards the people he blesses them in the same way, saying "The light of Christ appears to all." This ceremony is full of symbolism, signifying that Christ, foretold in the Old Testament, has brought light to the whole world. Then the reader begins the second reading.

(j) Incensing of the altar, and prostrations. The priest or bishop incenses the four sides of the altar while the deacon faces him and the concelebrating priests stand round the altar. During the incensing, the bishop and his concelebrants or the priest and deacon sing three verses of psalm 140 which speak of the incense offered as an evening sacrifice, followed by the little doxology (Glory to the Father). The first verse is each time repeated by alternate choirs. Finally the bishop or priest incenses the congregation while all make profound prostrations.

(k) Reading of the epistle and gospel, in the usual manner, on the great feasts already mentioned.

(2) Rite of the Presanctified.

(a) Ektenes of the complete Liturgy.

(b) Prayers over the catechumens, and after the fourth week prayers for those inscribed for baptism.

(c) Two prayers over the faithful.

(d) Incensing and Great Entrance, as in the complete liturgy. No prayers are recited by the celebrant, but instead of the Cheroubikon the choirs sing alternately a corresponding hymn. If there is a pontifical celebration, the bishop places the holy gifts in the hands of the first priest—otherwise the celebrant himself carries them. Accompanied as is usual for the Great Entrance, the deacon holding a lighted candle and the censer precedes him as he makes his way slowly among the people, who prostrate. No invocations are recited, and there are no commemorations—the impressive ceremony is carried out in complete silence. The bishop receives the holy gifts at the doors of the sanctuary and places them with the usual ceremonies on the Altar.

(e) As there is no sacrifice, all the part of the liturgy between the prayer of the offertory and the final blessing of the anaphora disappears, together with the accompanying ceremonies.

(f) After the holy gifts are again covered, the deacon goes out of the sanctuary and recites the double collect while the priest says a long secret prayer.

(g) From the Lord's Prayer to the end of the liturgy there is no change in the order of prayers or ceremonies. At the elevation the priest says "The presanctified gifts for the holy" and then uncovers them.

Some surprise may be felt that the celebrants drink several mouthfuls of wine poured into the chalice: but first we must note that the wine is considered as sanctified (not consecrated) by its contact with a portion of the 'Lamb': further, the intention is to follow as closely as possible the course of the complete liturgy: and also no word is said during this action. Another surprising act is the distribution of the antidoron: the reason for this is that in fact every day the faithful make offerings of bread, which is blessed in the ordinary way by the celebrant after the Great Entrance. A further point to notice is that after the bishop enters the sanctuary he himself recites all the prayers and says the ekphoneses—the other concelebrating clergy are present solely as his assistants; but the first priest carries the chalice to the altar of the prothesis, and reads the prayer behind the ambo.

DOM PLACID DE MEESTER.

THE ASCETIC AND THEOLOGICAL TEACHING OF GREGORY PALAMAS

III.—THE UNCREATED DIVINE LIGHT.

IN the foregoing chapter we have attempted to set forth Gregory's doctrine of the Deity in His inapprehensible and inaccessible "supra-substance" and in His self-revelation to the world through the uncreated "energies." These energies are countless; in them the creature really communes with the Deity and God is present in the creation. One such Divine revelation to the world is, according to Gregory's teaching, the uncreated Divine Light. Like all the Divine energies, it is uncreated, yet it is not the Deity Itself in Its "supra-substance"; in the words of Gregory Palamas "God is called light not according to substance, but according to energy."¹ Therefore all we have written in the preceding chapter on "substance and energy" and their respective relation to God, is applicable to the Divine Light. Such, in short, is Gregory's theologico-philosophical presentation of the problem of uncreated Light. Mystically he touches on this theme, when he describes the higher spiritual states in which those who have attained to them "mingle in an unuttered manner with the Light which transcends reason and feeling."² The doctrine of the uncreated Light has, however, so great an importance for us both in the ascetico-dogmatical system of Gregory Palamas and in the polemics which are directed against him, that we think it necessary to deal with it in more detail.

It seems hardly necessary to prove that the doctrine of the Divine Light (whatever the meaning attached to this expression) is not anything new or expressed for the first time by the XIVth cent. hesychasts of Mt. Athos. Already in Holy Scripture, both in the Old and the New Testaments, we find the Divine Light frequently mentioned. Thus in the Old Testament we read in the psalter "in Thy light we shall see light" (ps. xxxv, 10). The prophet Isaiah exclaims "Then shall Thy light break forth as the morning . . . and the glory of the Lord shall gather thee up" (ch. lviii, 8). "Then shall Thy light rise up in darkness and Thy darkness shall be as the noon-day" (ch. lviii, 10). "The Sun of Truth" is the name given by the prophet Malachi to the coming Messiah (Mal. vi, 2). In the New Testament Christ Himself says that "the just shall shine as the sun, in the Kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii, 43), and the holy apostle Paul writes of God "Who inhabiteth light inaccessible" (I Tim. vi, 16). But the most vivid and clear

expressions are to be found in the gospel of St. John and in the epistle of the holy apostle John: "I am the light of the world" (John viii, 12) . . . "I am the light that has come into the world" (John xii, 6) . . . "God is light" (I John i, 5) . . . "In Him was life and the life was the light of men" (John i, 4) . . . "That was the true light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" (John i, 9), etc. In the Apocalypse we find prophetic visions of a heavenly city as of a kingdom of Divine Light: "And the city hath no need of the sun nor of the moon, to shine in it. For the glory of God hath enlightened it: and the Lamb is the lamp thereof" (Ap. xxi, 23) . . . "And night shall be no more. And they shall not need the light of the lamp, nor the light of the sun, because the Lord God shall enlighten them" (Ap. xxii, 5). The liturgical chants and texts of the Orthodox Church are full of expressions concerning the Divine Light (let us recall, *e.g.*, the names of the Saviour, "Peaceful Light," and "True Light," etc.). In the creed the Church confesses her faith in the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity as "Light of Light." The same thing can be traced throughout the patristic and ascetic literature of the Eastern Church and the expressions which describe the Light designate now God Himself (as the object of vision), now the inward state of the one who apprehends Him (we shall see later that, in a certain sense, these two are the same). In the latter meaning (the mystical state) the ascetic writers of the Orthodox Church often use the expression "Divine illumination" (ἡ θεία ἔλλαμψις). This mystical term is much favoured by B. Maximus the Confessor (580-662). But the vision of the Light is described with peculiar power and characteristic literary talent by B. Simeon the New Theologian (949-1022), both in his maxims and, even more, in his amazing poetry. It can even be said without exaggeration that no other orthodox mystic either before or after B. Simeon the New Theologian has described his experience of the Divine Light so vividly, sincerely and in such great detail. On the other hand ideas concerning the Divine Light uncreated, incomparable with and distinct from everything created are found in many ecclesiastical writers long before Gregory Palamas (though not in a systematic form or with any theological foundation). Without setting ourselves the task of exhausting in this article the "prehesychastic" period of the doctrine of the Uncreated Light (this might form the subject of special research, most interesting and significant for the understanding of Gregory Palamas), we will merely give a few examples. Already in the IVth cent. B. Macarius the Egyptian in his sixth

"Word" writes "The crowns and diadems received by Christians are not creatures."³ B. Theodorite (Vth cent.) in his "History of Godlovers" describes an ascetic who "peeped out" of his cell and saw "a light not of a lamp nor made by hand (οὐ χειροποιήτων), but God-given and shining with highest grace."⁴ Leaving the many visions of Light which are mentioned in the lives of the saints (as e.g., in that of Saint Paul of Latros (Xth cent.) let us come again to B. Simeon the New Theologian. In his works the word "uncreated" (ἄκτιστον) is used particularly often in descriptions of inward illumination, and that not in the form of theoretical discussions, but as immediate data of mystical experience. (It is easy to understand why Combefis calls B. Simeon "fons omnis Palamis erroris").⁵ Thus, in his first hymn, B. Simeon the New Theologian speaks of the fire which alights on the human heart seeking after God, and calls this fire "uncreated."⁶ In another hymn he speaks of his mind aspiring to be altogether outside creatures in order to reach the "uncreated and ungraspable radiance."⁷ Further on he writes that this radiance "has separated me from the seen and the unseen and has bestowed on me the vision of the uncreated and the joy of separation from all created . . . and I became united with the uncreated and incorruptible which has no beginning and is unseen by all."⁸ But besides these undeniable testimonies to the uncreatedness of the Divine illumination in general, no less definite indications can be found in ancient patristic literature of the Light of Christ's Transfiguration, i.e., precisely that which, in the opinion of many, constitutes the novelty and even the chief content of the doctrine of Gregory Palamas. Thus already St. Gregory the Theologian (329-390) in his "Word" on Holy Baptism speaks of the Light of Thabor as of a visible manifestation of the Deity: "The Light," he writes, "is the Deity revealed to the disciples on the mountain."⁹ Even more interesting in this respect are the remarkable "Words" of St. Andrew of Crete (660-740) and St. John Damascene (750) on the feast of the Transfiguration of our Lord.¹⁰ The doctrine of the Light of Thabor as developed by them (especially by St. John Damascene) is so similar to that of Gregory Palamas not only in its content but even in its formulations that we deem it unnecessary to speak of it here at length since we would be obliged to repeat ourselves when dealing with the doctrine of Gregory himself on this subject. We need only say that we find in St. John Damascene (though in a rather less developed and less systematic way than in Gregory Palamas) the presentation of the Light of the Transfiguration as "the Light of the Deity," "inaccessible,"

"indescribable," "the Glory of God," "the Kingdom of God," and as "uncreated." This last is asserted by St. John Damascene with all possible definiteness in that part of his "Word" in which he justifies the necessarily inexact comparison made by the Evangelists between the Light of the Transfiguration and the light of the sun, reflecting that inexactitude is inevitable "since it is impossible to represent the uncreated adequately in the creature."¹¹

But if there can be no doubt as to the antiquity of the orthodox teaching on Divine illumination there are yet certain questions in connection with it which need to be studied: what is the nature of the Light? how does the vision of it occur? is it only an inner illumination of grace or something other and greater than this? All these questions become peculiarly significant and important when we go on from the ancient mystics and theologians to the XIV cent. hesychasts and especially to Gregory Palamas. This is because (partly owing to the natural development of theological thought, and partly in the process of answering the attacks of opponents) the doctrine of Divine Light has received in their works an almost central importance and a far more systematic character. We will turn therefore directly to the work of Gregory Palamas.

We find the Divine Light fairly often discussed in the works of Gregory Palamas. Nowhere, however, does he give a clear explanation of what is meant by it. This reticence is the natural consequence of the nature of the Divine Light which cannot be grasped by the reason nor expressed in words, and is uncreated; nor can anything exactly like it be found in the created world. Gregory insists on this inexpressible nature of the Divine Light and the impossibility to apprehend it for anyone who has not been found worthy actually to see it. But although the uncreated cannot be expressed and is altogether distinct from the created, there are in the created world phenomena which, however feebly and imperfectly, reflect the Divine Light. This is in the first place the sun and the creaturely light diffused by it. That is why, explains Gregory Palamas, it is said in the Gospels that Christ shone on Mount Thabor "like the sun." Following St. John Damascene (as quoted above) he adds "This is only a dim image but it is impossible to represent the uncreated adequately (*ἀπαραλείπτως*) in the created."¹² He writes in another place: "what the sun is in the sensible world, that God is in the intellectual."¹³ This comparison between Divine Light and that of the sun must not, however, be understood to mean that the former is in any sense material like the latter. The idea of anything material or sensible

in the uncreated Light is firmly rejected by Gregory and described by him as a crude distortion of his teaching. He continually calls it an "immaterial Light," (ἀύλον) and says that there is nothing sensible in the light which shone upon the apostles on Mt. Thabor,¹⁴ and is indignant with the worldly-wise who "expatiating on what they have not seen and vainly puffing themselves out with their carnal mind, ignorantly turn into sensible the mind transcending Divine and spiritual radiance."¹⁵ But, on the other hand, it would be wrong to imagine this Light to be purely an illumination of the reason, a mere rational apprehension, thus depriving the word "light" of any real content and making it simply an allegory. We think that the detailed "intellectualisation" of the uncreated light would be out of keeping with many of Gregory's statements as well as with the general tendency of his mysticism (as can be gathered from our exposition of his ascetic teaching—v. Ch. I). In fact, in one of Gregory's "Words" against Akindin (which is not yet published in full) a whole section is devoted to the rejection of the opinion that mere knowledge (γνώσις) is the light.¹⁶ One may rather think that the comparison between the created and the uncreated Light bears the character of a symbolic reality and is based on the idea peculiar to many of the Eastern Fathers (as also to neo-platonic philosophers) that this finite created world is, as it were, the reflection and likeness of its Divine heavenly prototype, eternally existing in the Divine consciousness, and that, consequently, our earthly creaturely world can be seen as a representation and dim likeness of the uncreated Light, infinitely distant from it, yet at the same time really, though inconceivably, like it. As to the uncreated Light itself—the prototype of the created world, it is one of the forms of the manifestation and revelation of God in the world; in other words the uncreated is in the created really (not merely allegorically) and is contemplated by the saints as ineffable Divine glory and beauty. We think that such a symbolical realism lies at the bottom of the whole of Gregory's teaching on the Divine Light and only in this way can be understood many peculiar (and at first sight rather strange) points of this teaching.¹⁷ However this may be, the uncreated Light as supernatural and gratuitous is altogether distinct from the sensible as also from the natural-rational. We read in the *Tomos of Holy Mount* : "The light properly apprehended by the intellect is other than that apprehended by the senses; the sensible light manifests sensible objects but the light of the mind is the knowledge contained in thoughts. Consequently sight and intellect do not properly apprehend the same light but each

acts according to and within the limits of its nature. ' But when those who are worthy receive the spiritual and supernatural grace and strength they see with both sense and intellect that which transcends all sense and intellect as it is known only to God and to those who experience such action " (of grace).¹⁸ This state of Divine illumination and vision of uncreated Light is described by Gregory Palamas in the following way : " To those who see God He is Light and nothing else ; and that which the sun is in the sensible world, God is in the intellectual . . . (the man) who has received as his blessed portion the Divine action . . . is himself, as it were, the Light and is with the Light and together with the Light consciously beholds that which, without such grace, is hidden from all ; (for he is) raised not only above the bodily senses but above everything known to us . . . for he whose heart is purified sees God . . . Who being the Light dwells with and reveals Himself to those who love Him and whom He loves . . . shewing Himself to those who are purified in mind as in a mirror. Remaining invisible in Himself like the face reflected in a mirror, appearing (in it) yet (itself) unseen ; and it is quite impossible to see anything in the mirror and at the same time to see that which reflects itself in it."¹⁹

Yet this uncreated Light, immaterial and insensible as it is, does not always remain only inward, " a Divine illumination mysteriously and unutterably coming into being."²⁰ It may be thought that in some cases, without changing its nature, it exteriorises itself and from an inner experience it becomes an objective event and even acquires some properties of the visible light. Something like this is found already in B. Theodorite's description of the " uncreated Light," when he says that a certain ascetic having " looked out of the window," saw it (v. above). We must conclude the same thing from some examples brought by Gregory Palamas. Thus he speaks of the " Divine radiance and light of which Adam partook before the fall, being (therefore) not naked, but clothed in the true garment of glory . . . and far more beautiful . . . than those who now are clothed in cloth of gold and wear crowns of precious stones."²¹ It is this Light, the " grace of eternal life," which shone from the face of Moses whose glory the children of Israel could not behold.²² The radiance of this light on the face of the proto-martyr Stephen was unbearable to the Jews who looked on it.²³ The same uncreated Light dazzled St. Paul on the way to Damascus,²⁴ and on that occasion its action, in spite of its immaterial nature, affected his bodily eyes and was seen by some of those present. This Light, " the Light of

the Resurrection," filled the Sepulchre of Our Lord when Mary Magdalen came there after the resurrection and "divinely beheld" this Light. "We must examine," writes Gregory Palamas "... how it is that, while it was still dark, she saw everything in detail (the more so) as it was (dark) outside and she saw what was inside the cave. It is evident that it was dark outside as the sensible daylight had not yet fully arisen, but the cave was filled with the Light of the Resurrection; divinely seen by Mary, it excited greater love of Christ and gave strength to her eyes to receive the angelic vision and made her able not only to see but to converse with the angel. Such is this Light."²⁵ It is interesting that in this case we see as it were the double operation of the Light: the one purely spiritual, and inward, exciting greater love of the Lord and making Mary capable of seeing angels and conversing with them, the other lighting up the interior of the cave so strongly and in a manner similar to that of material light that it was possible to see everything in it "exactly," although it was still dark outside and the "sensible daylight had not yet arisen." In a word the "sensible daylight" emphasises the "supra-sensible" nature of the Light within the cave.²⁶ Finally the most vivid example of the uncreated Divine Light is the Light which shone on our Lord on the Mount of the Transfiguration and was seen there by His disciples. This "Light of Thabor" being one of the chief objects of "hesychastic disputes," came to be regarded as the "classical example" of uncreated Light so that many people identify the uncreated Light with this "Light of the Transfiguration" and limit it to this one manifestation. But as we have seen, besides the Transfiguration the Divine Light has many and various ways of manifesting itself in the world.

Gregory Palamas speaks much of the Light of Thabor in his works. But he describes it chiefly in apophatic terms. This is natural since, as we have seen, the Light of the Transfiguration transcends all thought and sense... Thus he calls it "unuttered, uncreated, near the substance, incorporeal, inaccessible... without end or limits," etc.²⁷ On the positive side he characterises it chiefly as the beauty and glory of God... "This prototypical and changeless beauty and glory of God, glory of Christ, glory of the Spirit, ray of God."²⁸ It is important to note that this light according to the teaching of Gregory Palamas is not anything merely subjective, arising in our consciousness like some fancy: is not generally speaking an appearance (φάσμα or ἰνδαλμα), or something which came to be at a particular moment (the Transfiguration) and soon vanished. This Light is eternally with God and

only manifested itself on Mount Thabor to the disciples and that only in part (hence we may conclude that this Light exists as an objective reality, *i.e.*, independently of our consciousness). In itself it is unchanged with only this difference that, being from eternity extra-spacial, like the Deity Itself, from the moment of incarnation it became concentrated in the body of Christ in Whom dwelt the fulness of Divinity.²⁹ Generally speaking, what changes is not the Light (It remains unchanged), but our own capacity to apprehend It in a greater or less measure, the degree of our union with God. It is even more important to note Gregory's teaching on the manner of seeing the Light, for the wrong understanding of this side of his doctrine is the chief cause of the misunderstandings which arise in general in connection with the doctrine of the Light. Already, as is known, Barlaam and his partisans in their attacks on Gregory started out from the assumption that he taught the Light of Mt. Thabor to have been seen by the bodily eyes of the apostles and therefore (concluded Barlaam) this light is sensible, material, and, as such, created, and not Divine—something in the nature of an atmospheric phenomenon, as may be concluded from certain words of Barlaam.³⁰ In reality however Gregory (who did not, it is true, altogether deny that the Light of Thabor was seen by bodily eyes) explains that the eyes of the apostles were, at that time, transfigured by the power of the Holy Ghost, and the vision of the Light itself did not happen through the ordinary process of natural vision, but was supernatural and gratuitous. In accordance with the whole spirit of Gregory's teaching the body is not here put aside as incapable of taking part in the Divine life (such a view would have appeared to Gregory as a manichean estrangement from the body), but is transfigured even here on earth by the power of the Holy Ghost and lives the life of eternity . . .³¹ Here are some texts from the works of Gregory Palamas to confirm what has been said: having refuted the opinion of heretics that the Light of Thabor was an "apparition," "a symbol which now is and now is not and has no real being,"³² Gregory asserts that "the Light of the Transfiguration of our Lord neither comes into being nor ceases to be and cannot be described nor apprehended by bodily powers; it was indeed seen by the eyes of the body . . . but through a transfiguration of the senses (the beholders who were in the secrets of God passed at that moment from the body to the Spirit."³³ "Neither is that Light sensible, not did those who saw it, behold simply through the eyes of sense, but through eyes changed by the power of the Divine Spirit."³⁴ "Thus (Christ) is trans-

figured, yet does not cease to be what He was or become what He was not (before the transfiguration), but shows to his disciples that which He was.³⁵ (The apostles) saw, truly they saw this uncreated and Divine radiance, but God (at the same time) remained unseen in His hidden supra-substance.”³⁶

This Divine radiance, seen by the apostles on Mount Thabor, is accessible to those purified by the Spirit even here on earth, although the full revelation of the Divine Light will be given only in the future life when we shall see God face to face. Therefore Gregory Palamas (following in this St. John Damascene) speaks of “the great sight of the Light of the Transfiguration of our Lord,” “the Divine and unuttered Light,” as “the sacrament of the eighth day,” *i.e.*, “of the future life,” “the vision and delight of saints in unthinkable life.”³⁷ In this sense the uncreated Light is often called the Kingdom of God which is to be fully revealed at the end of time, but is even now partly shewn to spirit-bearing people in proportion to their inward perfection and capacity to receive the Divine. “This Divine experience,” writes Gregory Palamas, “is given by measure and can be in a greater or less degree divisibly divided and proportioned to the merit of those who receive it.”³⁸ Yet even in the future world, however full the revelation of Divine glory and its immediate contemplation “face to face” in the vision of uncreated Light, “the hidden Divine supra-substance” will yet remain forever invisible and inaccessible to the creature since its greatness transcends all creaturely capacity to receive. Therefore the Council of 1352 emphasises that the Light of the Transfiguration is not “the supra-substantial substance of God, for that remains totally invisible and incommunicable: for no one has ever seen God, *i.e.*, as He is in His substance, but rather . . . the essential power of the supra-substantial substance, inseparably proceeding from it and shewn by God out of charity to persons whose mind is purified.”³⁹ In his “Word” on the Transfiguration Gregory protests against those who “do not call the Light which shone then . . . Divine Glory, Kingdom of God, beauty, grace, lightness,” but maintain that it is the Divine substance; ⁴⁰ he declares that it “suits the accursed Messalians to think that they see the Divine substance.”⁴¹ Gregory sees a certain reflection of this impossibility to see the Divine substance in the circumstance that, whereas disciples of Christ were able to behold the Light of the Transfiguration which proceeded from His countenance, they fell on their faces when they were overshadowed by the cloud of light. “What is this cloud of light,” asks Gregory Palamas, “and

how is it that, being light, it overshadowed them? Is it not that inaccessible Light in which God dwells? . . . The same thing is here Light and dark, overshadowing as a consequence of its transcendent lightness."⁴² And although the Light from the Lord's face was also inaccessible "and limitless," yet it shone then with a paler radiance and so allowed them to see; but later it shone much more strongly and so became invisible because of its greater lightness."⁴³ Gregory also interprets in this way the expressions found both in Holy Scripture and in patristic writings symbolically describing the dwelling-place of God as "darkness."⁴⁴ At the same time the radiance of Divine Glory, His uncreated Light is not, according to the whole meaning of Gregory's teaching something separate from God Himself, but is God Himself in His indivisible and undiminished revelation. Therefore it would be a mistake to think that, according to Gregory, the saints in heaven, instead of seeing God, see only some Light which exists separately from Him. The inaccessibility of the Divine substance does not prevent us from seeing God "face to face" in the future world.⁴⁵

Gregory's teaching on the uncreated Divine Light is closely connected with his teaching on grace. This connection is self-evident in as much as the Divine illumination and vision of the Light are conceived by Gregory Palamas not as some natural human achievement but as the immediate action of Divine power inwardly appropriated by man. This immediate Divine action, in so far as it takes place within man and inwardly illumines him, is identified by Gregory Palamas with Divine grace. He speaks of it as of uncreated and unlimited Divine power (energy), which transcends all thought and feeling and everything created, bringing about the union of those on whom it is bestowed with God and deifying them (though without any loss of the created character of their nature). "This Divine lightness and energy," writes Gregory, "which deifies those who partake of it, is a certain Divine grace, but is not the Divine essence; not because it is absent . . . for the Divine essence is (present) everywhere, but because it is inaccessible, since no creature . . . is able to partake of it; the Divine energy and grace of the Spirit which is present everywhere and inseparable from Him, is incommunicable and as though absent, for those who are unable to commune with it on account of their impurity."⁴⁶ He writes in another place: "The Divine and deifying radiance and grace is not the substance, but the energy of God."⁴⁷ Gregory wrote much concerning the uncreated character of grace and refuted the views of his opponents who saw something heretical in his teaching

and considered those to be heretics who "call the deifying Divine grace uncreated, unborn and hypostatic."⁴⁸ In accordance with this, deification itself is understood by him not as a natural process of imitation of God and union with Him by means of the virtues or as something proper to man's rational nature (in that case man would become God essentially), but as an ineffable Divine gift, the fruit of the action of His grace (though prepared for by the virtues). "And so," writes Gregory Palamas, "the grace of deification is above nature and virtue; all these are infinitely below it. For all our virtues and all our imitation of God (according to our capacity) make those who have these virtues capable of Divine union; but grace mysteriously accomplishes that ineffable union."⁴⁹ "By means of it (of grace) the entire Godhead is contained (*περιχωρεῖ*) in those who are worthy and the saints are entirely contained in the entire Godhead."⁵⁰ "God's gift—deification,"⁵¹ "deification brings him who is deified outside the limits of his nature."⁵² Therefore also those who partake of Divine grace may be called, according to it (*κατ' αὐτήν* and not according to substance) beginningless and endless, as Gregory Palamas writes in his third Word against Akindin which has the sub-title: "Testimonies of saints showing that those who partake of Divine grace are, according to it (to grace), without beginning and without end."⁵³ To define more closely the connection between the uncreated Light and Divine grace in the teaching of Gregory we may say that for him the uncreated Light and graces are substantially identical. More exactly, both are Divine actions. This is clearly stated by Gregory Palamas when he calls the Light of Thabor "uncreated and essential grace,"⁵⁴ when he speaks of the "Light of Divine grace"⁵⁵ and rejects the opinion of those who call "the deifying Divine grace a property of the rational nature arising from imitation alone and not a supernatural and ineffable radiance and Divine action invisibly seen and unattainably attained by those who are worthy."⁵⁶ It would seem therefore that to express Gregory's teaching most exactly, we must say that the uncreated Light and its vision are not so much the result of the operation in us of Divine grace as the manifestation of that grace itself.⁵⁷ And this uncreated Light which is identified with grace may, as we have already seen according to Gregory Palamas, manifest itself in many different forms—from purely inward illumination mysteriously experienced by the heart, to an, as it were, exterior radiance, partly similar to the action of earthly light, yet at the same time inwardly illuminating the seer. It may even be thought that, in the higher spiritual states, Divine

grace, while remaining invisible and "supra-intellectual," is manifested at the same time as ineffable "supra-sensible" Light, unthinkable contemplated, whether inwardly or outwardly by those worthy of such a state. Nowhere, however, in the works of Gregory Palamas, do we find any suggestion that the higher degrees of grace are necessarily accompanied by the "supra-sensible vision of light" or that, if it remains only "supra-intellectual," it is therefore incomplete. We may say that, according to the teaching of Gregory Palamas, the forms of God's gratuitous action are many and varied and no general law can be applied to them.

Such is Gregory's doctrine of uncreated Light in its general features. This doctrine has always been the stumbling block of rationalist theological thought, which rejected it as not in keeping with the notion of God as pure and simple Spirit and as ascribing to Him something material. We think that such an appreciation of Gregory's teaching is due to the difficulty (especially for those educated in the spirit of Catholic mysticism) to conceive the existence of immaterial Light and the involuntary substitution for it of a material light. But if we succeed in overcoming this difficulty, the teaching of Gregory Palamas will be revealed to us in its deepest mystical and theological meaning. Mystically its significance lies in that it confirms and gives a foundation to the genuineness of our spiritual experience in which the Divine and uncreated is immediately given. We contemplate not some created effect of the inaccessible Divine cause, not some light distinct from the uncreated Light, but the Divine itself in its reality.⁵⁸ In this possibility of immediate contemplation of the Divine and union with It, in the possibility to overcome by grace our creaturely limits and to come out of the bounds of our natural being lies the meaning and justification of man's mystical way. On the other hand, in the manifestation of uncreated Light, God reveals Himself to the world in the form of incorruptible and immaterial beauty, of which earthly light and the creaturely beauty of the world are a pale reflection. According to the teaching of Gregory Palamas God is not to be attained by man's rational power alone (as the partisans of theological intellectualism would say). He is the source and archetype of true beauty and, as such, reveals Himself to the world in the incorruptible radiance of His Divine glory. The Council of 1352 calls the Light of Tabor "Inaccessible Light," "unthinkable outpouring of Divine radiance," "unuttered glory and perfect and eternal glory of the Deity, timeless glory of the Son and Kingdom of God, perfect . . . beauty next to the Divine beatific nature, essential glory of God,

Divinity of the Father and of the Spirit, reflectedly shining in the con-substantial Son.”⁵⁹ This contemplation of the uncreated Divine Light as “perfect beauty”⁶⁰ seems to us to be one of the deepest and most valuable intuitions of Gregory Palamas into the mystery of the Divine life of the Triune Deity and its relation to the created world.

IV.—CONCLUSION.

*The place of Gregory Palamas in Orthodox theology.*⁶¹

In the foregoing chapters we have tried to set forth in a systematic way, and with quotations to support our deductions, the fundamental theological and ascetic views of Gregory Palamas. In conclusion we wish to say a few words on the significance of his teaching in the general development of Eastern Orthodox thought. We think it important for the right understanding of this matter to clear up the questions : how far can Gregory be regarded as a traditional Church theologian, to what ascetic and theological currents of the Orthodox Church does he belong and in what way did he enrich her theological treasure. Unfortunately in this as in other questions objective study has been made difficult by the controversial or, on the other hand, apologetic methods of approach. In keeping with their own confessional views some have tried to prove the complete traditionalism of Gregory while others saw in him an innovator harshly breaking away from the whole foregoing church theological tradition and “inventing” a quite “unheard of” theological system.⁶² But neither of these, in our opinion, one-sided views appears to have much foundation in fact. In particular, that opinion seems to us historically false which considers Gregory’s teaching to be quite unconnected with the previous ascetical and theological traditions and to have arisen entirely out of accidental causes (the need to find arguments against Barlaam’s attacks on the monks).⁶³ Not to speak of the fact that such examples of “creation” unconnected with the past are almost unknown in the history of human thought, the possibility of such “innovation” appears particularly unlikely in the field of Byzantine theology, always extremely conservative, traditional and clinging to the past. As to limiting Gregory’s connection with the past to his mysticism⁶⁴ and denying it of his dogmatic teaching, this appears to us mistaken in view of the undoubted close interconnection and interdependence of the dogmatic and ascetic teaching of the Orthodox Church (in its notions of God, of the world, of man, of soul and body, good and evil, sin and redemption, etc.). This connection is, generally speaking, so close that it is impossible artificially to isolate the ascetic from the

dogmatic elements in the teaching of the holy fathers without forcing their meaning. This is particularly true of Gregory, the organic character of whose outlook with its inward unity makes such separation completely wrong. But besides all this the mere fact that Gregory Palamas and his followers so readily appealed to the authority of ancient patristic and ascetic church literature where they easily found numerous confirmations of their doctrine,⁶⁵ whereas their opponents, with all their desire to appear traditionalist, were obliged to use mostly abstract arguments, would shew that Gregory felt himself to be in the stream of ancient church tradition, as he undoubtedly was.⁶⁶ In fact his ascetic teaching is no other in substance than the ancient teaching of the way of solitary contemplative life which goes back to Evagrius of Pontus and is known in the history of monasticism under the name of silence or "hesychasm."⁶⁷ In particular the teaching of Gregory Palamas on mental prayer, its methods and the higher spiritual states is very near to the doctrine of St. John Climacus, Hesychius and Philotheus of Sinai, B. Simeon the New Theologian and B. Gregory the Sinaite. As we have seen, the beginnings of a doctrine of uncreated Divine Light are already in B. Macarius of Egypt, B. Theodoret and, especially, in B. Simeon the New Theologian. The teaching on the Light of Thabor is found in St. Gregory the Theologian; the works of St. Andrew of Crete and of St. John Damascene contain the chief features of the doctrine of Gregory Palamas on the uncreated Light of the Transfiguration of Our Lord. In his doctrine of grace he is nearest to B. Macarius of Egypt. Finally the teaching on the "Divine substance and energy" goes back in its basic propositions and even in its terminology to St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. John Damascene. An even closer interior likeness though with certain differences of expression exists between this teaching and the work of Dionysius the Areopagite,⁶⁸ where he speaks symbolically of the "coming forward" of God (πρόδος θεού), of His sleep and wakefulness and of His inapprehensible "supra-substance" (ἡ ἐν κρυφαῖς ὑπερουσιότης). Yet in spite of the undoubtedly traditional character of all the fundamental ascetic and theological views of Gregory Palamas we cannot regard him as one who merely repeats what has been said before him or as a compiler lacking all originality.⁶⁹ He was not a mere compiler if only because the starting point of his theologising was his own spiritual experience and not only the study of the books of the holy fathers. His teaching is not a collection of various elements superficially connected, but forms a harmonious whole penetrated by one fundamental

thought. All the traditional ascetic and theological problems are newly experienced and newly set by him. Much of what had been insufficiently formulated or developed received from Gregory a further more systematic elaboration and theologico-philosophical foundation. Thus in the domain of ascetics he developed and gave a theologico-philosophical basis to the traditional church teaching on the significance of the body in the spiritual life and on the methods of artistic mental prayer. Holding to the ancient patristic idea of man as a microcosm, and of the two worlds, visible and invisible, Gregory completed this teaching by shewing the mutual relation of the human and angelic worlds, emphasising at the same time that man, as an active being capable of creativeness, is endowed with the Divine likeness in a greater degree than the angel. The scattered mystical statements of his predecessors on the uncreated Light first attain in him the character of a systematic theological doctrine. The doctrine of grace as Divine power is also developed by him in greater detail than before and, what is more important, is connected with the rest of the teaching on God (the same can be said of uncreated Light). The teaching on God in His "hidden supra-substance" and "exteriorised energy," although it does not belong to Gregory Palamas, first receives from him a theological and philosophical foundation in connection with the problem of Divine simplicity. To sum up in short the significance of Gregory Palamas in the development of Orthodox thought, we may say that the traditional ascetico-mystical teaching of the Orthodox East not only finds in his works its final and systematic expression but also its theological and philosophical justification. By his doctrine of the uncreated Light and Divine energies Gregory Palamas gives an indestructible theological foundation to the traditional mystical teaching of the Orthodox Church, since only on the basis of this doctrine is it possible consistently to assert the reality of the community between God and man and the reality of deification without falling into the pantheistic confusion of creature with Creator which inevitably occurs if the divine substance is identified with His energy. Therefore it will hardly be an exaggeration to compare Gregory's work and struggles with the theological achievements and fight for Orthodoxy of St. Athanasius of Alexandria. This comparison appears to us the more true because, just as St. Athanasius the Great brought into ecclesiastical usage, in spite of the protests of the pseudo-traditionalists of the time (we have in mind Eusebius of Cesarea and other semi-Aryans) the previously unknown theological term "*ὁμοούσιος*" (con-substantial) and expressed by it

the ancient though not previously well formulated Church teaching on the Second Hypostasis; so Gregory, by his bold development and theological refining of the already existing doctrine of Light and of the Divine Energies, expressed and grounded the traditional teaching of the Church on the reality of the manifestation of the uncreated Deity in the created world, on the reality of mystical communion between God and man and the possibility of man's overcoming through grace his creaturely limits without any pantheistic confusion or absorption by the Divine Being. In this theological grounding of the data of the Church's mystical experience in its utmost depths and limits lies the great and permanent importance of Gregory Palamas. That is why the Orthodox Church yearly celebrates his holy memory so solemnly and so lovingly,⁷⁰ venerating in him not only the hero whose personal life gives forth the odour of holiness, but one of the pillars of her "celestially woven" theology, the glorious confessor "of the great sacrament of piety."

BASIL KRIVOSHEIN

(Monk of Mt. Athos).

¹ "Φῶς ὁ θεὸς οὐ κατ' οὐσίαν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐνέργειαν λέγεται." Against Akindin' P.G. 150, 823.

² See e.g., 51—in April E.C.Q. It is interesting to note that this was written by Gregory Palamas before the beginning of the "Hesychastic disputes" (i.e., before Barlaam's attacks on the monks of Mount Athos). Hence we may judge that Gregory's teaching on the Divine Light did not arise purely out of the controversial needs of the moment but has its independent mystical and historical sources.

³ Hom. 6. P. G. 34, 521A-524A. K. Holl: *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim Griechischen Mönchtum. Eine Studie zu Symeon dem Neuen Theologen*. Leipzig 1898. S. 217.

⁴ P.G. 82, 1328 B.C. v. Holl op.c. S. 211-212.

⁵ Holl. op. c. S.3.

⁶

Ἔστι πῦρ τὸ θεῖον ὕπτως

Ἄκτιστον, ἀδράτον γε, ἀναρχον καὶ ἄϋλόν τε

Ἀναλλοίωτον ἐῖς ἅπαν, ἀπερίγραφτον ὡσαύτως,

Ἀβεστον, ἀθάνατον, ἀπερίληπτον πάντη

Ἐξω πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων

V. τοῦ ὁσίου καὶ θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Συμεῶν τοῦ Νέου θεολόγου τὰ εἰρ:σκόμενα. Edition Διονυσίου Ζαγοραίου. Ἐκ Σύμφ 1886 μερ. II Λογ I, σελ I.

⁷

.....γενέσθαι

τῶν κτισμάτων ὅλως ἔξω

ἵνα δράξηται τῆς αἴγλης

τῆς ἀκτίστου καὶ ἀλήπτου

Συμεῶν ὁ νέος θεολόγος. Ἐρωτες τῶν θείων ὕμνων. Λόγος 17, 350-59.

v. Gustav Soyter. *Byzantinische Dichtung*. Heidelberg, 1930, S.30.

⁸

“δρατῶν δ’ ἐχώρισέ με

καὶ συνῆψεν ἀοράτοις

καὶ τὸν ἄκτιστον ὄραῖν με

ἐχωρίσατο.....

καὶ ἠνώθη τῷ ἀκτίστῳ,

τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ, τῷ ἀναρχῳ

τῷ τοῖς πᾶσιν ὁρατῳ”

ibidem. 397-406. Soyter op. c. 531.

⁹ Εἰς τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα. P.G. 36, 365 A.

¹⁰ The "Word" of St. Andrew of Crete is published in P.G. 97, 932-957 and that of St. John Damascene in P.G. 96, 545-576. See also his Canon on the Transfiguration, P.G. 96, 848-852.

¹¹ "ἀμήχανον γὰρ ἀπαρλείπτως ἐν τῇ κτίσει τὸ ἔκτιστον εἰκονίζεσθαι."

P.G. 96, 565 A. Here are some examples of the way St. Andrew of Crete and St. John Damascene speak of the Light of Thabor: "τὸ ἀπόριστον καὶ ἄχρονον φῶς" (Andrew of Crete 97, 946 B), "τῆς δρατῆς θεοφανείας" (ibid. 941 C), "τῆς θείας φύσεως τὴν λαμπρότητα" (St. John Damascene 96, 552 B), "τὸ δικεῖον κάλλος" (ibid 96, 352 C), "τὴν ἄχρονον δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ Υἱοῦ, θεασάμενος" (ibid 96, 560 CD), "τῷ φωτὶ ἀσπράττοντι τῆς θεότητος" (ibid 96, 569 A), "τοῦτο τὸ φῶς κατὰ πάσης τῆς φύσεως ἔχει τὰ νικητήρια" (ibid 96, 569 B).

The similarity between the expressions used by St. Andrew of Crete and St. John Damascene about the Light of Thabor and those used by Gregory Palamas in his teaching on it is so striking that it cannot be denied even by those who wish to consider Gregory as an "innovator," v. e.g., Jugie, *Palamas* Col. 1760 and 1762. Also in his *Theologia Dogmatica*: "De lumine Thaborico in homiliis de Transfiguratione ab Andrea Cretensi, a Joanne Damasceno, ab aliis compositis... haud pauca occurrunt quae, si ad litteram intelligas, lumen Transfigurationis tibi exhibent ut quid divinum vel ipsam divinitatem." (p. 170). Also Guichardon p. 115. The attempt of F. Jugie to explain these expressions of the holy fathers as rhetoric or as poetic licence appears to us unconvincing. We cannot believe that the "rhetoric" of the holy fathers could be at odds with their dogmatic convictions. This is particularly so in the case of St. John Damascene who was first a dogmatist even in his poetic works and strove for theological exactness sometimes to the detriment of poetic beauty. It is impossible to imagine him calling the created uncreated in a fit of "poetic license."

¹² Ἀγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1232 C.D.

¹³ Εἰς τὴν Εἰσόδον. Ὁμιλ. σελ. 176.

¹⁴ Against Akindin; Word 4, P.G. 150, 818.

¹⁵ Εἰς τὴν Μεταμόρφωσιν. P.G. 151, 441 B.

¹⁶ Against Akindin, Word 7, 8.—P.G. 150, 826.

¹⁷ Similarly Mme. Lot Borodine says in her outstanding work: *La doctrine de la déification dans l'Eglise Grecque jusqu'au XI^e siècle*. (*Revue de l'histoire des religions* 1932-33): "Et il n'est pas question ici de simples analogies, de figures de rhétorique, mais de symboles substantiels, révélant une réalité pleine, le monde n'étant que la "semblance" de l'autre manifestant l'ενυπάρχον... le symbole n'est qu'un voile transparent" (op. c. 1933, p. 44).

"La lumière est bien l'aspect sous lequel Dieu se montre à sa création. La révélation où theophanie se fait dans et par la lumière.... Dieu est donc lumière au sens anagogique du mot." (ibid. p. 46). Mme. Lot Borodine's work represents one of the most valuable pieces of research on the mysticism of the Eastern Church (v. review of it by F. M. J. Congar, O.P. *La déification dans la tradition spirituelle de l'Orient—La vie spirituelle* No. 188—1 Mai, 1935, p. 91-107). However Mme. Lot-Borodin only touches in passing on the period which interests us: as may be seen from the title of her work, the systematic study of fourteenth century hesychasm is not part of her task. For a short exposition of the teaching on the Light of Thabor see F. G. Florovski, *The mystery of the Light of Thabor*, Sergievski Listki N. 3 (89), 1935, pp. 2-7.

¹⁸ Ἀγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1833 D.

¹⁹ Εἰς τὴν Εἰσόδον. Ὁμιλ. σελ. 176-177.

²⁰ "ἐλλάμψεις θείας μυστικῶς καὶ ἀποροήτως ἐγγινομένης" Council of 1341, P.G. 151, 680 A.

²¹ P.G. 151, 220 A and Κεφ. 150, 1168 D. (κεφ. 67).

²² P.G. 151, 220 B.

²³ Ibidem.

²⁴ Κεφ. P.G. 150, 1169 A. (κεφ. 67).

25 P.G. 151, 268 AB.

26 We do not find in this description of the Light of the Resurrection the term "uncreated." But from other expressions ("divinely saw," "such is that Light," etc.), from the whole way of speaking and from other analogous passages it is clear that what is meant is the uncreated Light.

27 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1238 B.

28 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1232 C.

29 V. on this *Εἰς τὴν Μεταμόρφωσιν*. P.G. 151, 440 A.

30 The teaching that the Light is seen by the eyes of the body was attributed to the hesychasts not only by Catholic controversialists as Allatius, but even by such a fine and outstanding student of the spiritual life of Eastern monasticism as K. Holl. He speaks of the vision of Light as "sinnliches Schauen" (op. c. S. 211), says that the hesychasts "behaupteten mit leiblichen Augen die Herrlichkeit Gottes zu sehen"—ibidem S. 219. No wonder that this sensible vision appears to Holl "unbedeutend, wenn nicht kleinlich" (ibid S. 213); he is astonished that such a great mystic as B. Simeon the New Theologian could give such importance to "ein inhaltlich so ärmliches Erlebnis, wie das Schauen des Lichtes" (ibid. S. 211). This astonishment comes from a wrong and quite unfounded interpretation of the vision of Divine Light as a phenomenon of sensible sight. We are glad that in this matter F. Jugie does not fall into the error of Holl and calls it a "calumny" to ascribe to Gregory Palamas the opinion that "lumen divinum et increatum videri posse oculis corporeis absque aliqua supernaturali elevatione et immutatione," (*Theologia dogmatica*, p. 146). Evidently on that occasion the learned scholar of Byzantine Theology overcame in F. Jugie the confessional controversialist.

31 We cannot agree with F. Jugie that the transfiguration of the eyes of the body by the power of the Holy Ghost is an incomprehensible and "philosophically absurd" miracle of divine omnipotence to which Gr. Palamas was driven to have recourse by the need to avoid the attacks of Barlaam ("ut a difficultate se expediret . . . ad miraculum confugit"—Jugie, *Theol. dogm.*, p. 95). The idea that the body participates in man's spiritual life, that it is capable of higher spiritual experiences and of transfiguration even in this life by the power of divine grace belongs to the fundamental propositions of Gregory's ascetic and theological outlook and is inseparably connected with his teaching on man. Of course such a transformation of the body (and in particular of the eyes of the body) is something supernatural and divine; there is in this nothing incomprehensible from the point of view of Gregory's general attitude. On the contrary it would be incomprehensible and inconsistent if Gregory were to deny the capacity of the bodily eyes to participate in divine contemplation.

32 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1232 B.

33 *Εἰς τὴν Μεταμόρφωσιν* P.G. 151, 429 A.

34 Ibid. P.G. 151, 433 B.

35 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1232 C.

36 Κεφ. P.G. 150, 1225 A. κεφ. 149.

37 *Εἰς τὴν Μεταμόρφωσιν*. P.G. 151, 428, AB. κεφ. P.G. 150, 1224 B. κεφ. 147.

38 Ibid. P.G. 151, 448 B.

39 Th. Uspenski, *Synodik for the week of Orthodoxy*, Odessa, 1893, p. 38. Also Guichardon, op. c. 173. P. Uspenski *Opravdania* . . . pp. 784-785.

40 *Εἰς τὴν Μεταμόρφωσιν*. P.G. 151, 445 BC.

41 Ibid. 151, 448 C.

42 Ibid. P.G. 151, 441 D.

43 Ibid. P.G. 151, 444 A.

44 In the same part of the Word on the Transfiguration.

45 F. M. Jugie is particularly insistent in ascribing to Gr. Palamas the opinion that the blessed will be deprived in the future life of the vision of the Triune God (v. *Theol. dog.* p. 144, Palamas, col. 1765). In

this Jugie sees one of the Palamite heresies. Yet the assertion of the possibility of immediate contemplation of the uncreated Deity and union with Him is one of the fundamental and characteristic propositions of the whole teaching of Gr. Palamas. Did not the inner significance of the struggle between the hesychasts who justified the mystical contemplative life and the Barlaamites who attacked it lie in that very defence of the possibility of immediate divine illumination? According to Gr. Palamas the divine Glory contemplated by the saints is the revelation of the Triune God Itself and not anything existing separately from Him. How can we explain this, in our opinion mistaken, interpretation of Gregory's teaching by F. Jugie who, in other parts of his work, expounds it so well? We think that, putting aside the tendency of Roman Catholic theologians in general to seek out heresies in the teaching of the Orthodox Church, Jugie's error comes from the difficulty experienced by him as a person trained in Latin scholasticism to conceive the inseparateness and unity of substance and energy together with their "God-fitting distinction." With regard to our union in the future life with the whole Godhead (and not with a part) as it is ascribed to Gr. Palamas, see note 50.

46 Κεφ. P.G. 150, 1188 B (κεφ. 93).

47 Κεφ. P.G. 150, 1160 C (κεφ. 69).

48 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1229 A.

49 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1229 B.

50 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1229 D.

51 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1229 C.

52 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1229 D.

53 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 813.

Such fulness of divine grace exceeding creaturely limits was bestowed on the Mother of God; Gregory writes of her: "she alone appears as the boundary (μεθόριον) between created and uncreated nature." P.G. 151, 472 B.

54 Th. Uspenski, *Synodik* . . . p. 30; Guichardon, p. 172.

55 Against Akindin, Word 4. P.G. 150, 816.

56 'Αγ. Τομ. P.G. 150, 1229 B.

57 The nature of grace is a question which, by its width and complexity exceeds the limits of the present work. Let us therefore restrict ourselves to a few necessary remarks. We think that the difference of conception with regard to the nature of grace constitutes one of the chief distinctions between the scholastic doctrines of the West and the theological consciousness of the Orthodox East. This difference can be shortly defined in this way: whereas the East conceives grace as divine attribute and power, as something divine and uncreated, the opinion which has established itself in Roman Catholic scholasticism is that grace, though supernatural, is yet something created for man and limited. The Catholic writers on Gr. Palamas understand the difference between the two worlds, Orthodox and Roman Catholic, which reflects itself in this question. This is how some of them formulate the teaching of their church on grace: "qualité ou habitus d'un ordre transcendant, il est vrai et supérieur à toute réalité créée, mais en dernière analyse crée, fini et limité." J. Bois, *Le synode hésychaste* . . . p. 50. Another modern Catholic writer of a Thomist tendency reminds us: "le concept scolastique de la grâce: la grâce, mode d'être créé en nous et nous déifiant." Guichardon, *Le problème* . . . p. 117. With regard to such a conception of grace we will merely remark that we cannot understand how something created can have the property of deifying, not being itself of a divine nature. The Orthodox teaching on grace will be found (though incompletely and poorly expressed) in various existing systems of Orthodox theology (e.g., Malinovski: "Divine attributes in relation to man and divine power, performing the salvation of man." Malinovski, *Orthodox dogmatic theology*, T. III, Sergiev Possad, 1909, p. 358). In ancient patristic literature the doctrine of grace as divine power (and not merely as some kind of human quality and capacity) is expressed more clearly. Gr. Palamas developed this doctrine still more fully so that Jugie even finds him heretical and remarks:

"la théorie de la grace incréée et les conséquences qu'en tire Palamas . . . frisent le panthéisme." *Palamas*, col. 1764-65. Another important distinction between the Eastern and Western teaching on grace appears to lie in this that the East in its realistic notion of salvation insists more on the felt, conscious and even visible side of grace (of course in the higher degrees of saintliness) whereas the juristic consciousness of the West inclines more to the idea of grace as the condition of justification not necessarily producing any real or felt result in the consciousness of the one who is saved. B. Simeon the New Theologian writes vividly in many parts of his work on the sensed quality of grace and the impossibility of its always remaining hidden and unconscious. In his characteristically paradoxical fashion he even asserts that whoever does not see God in this life will never see Him. V. his Word "*Περὶ τῶν ὁμῶν ἀγνώστως ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον*." Hausherr, *La méthode*, pp. 173-209.

⁵⁸ Catholics also admit that the saints in the highest degrees of spiritual perfection receive an illumination of grace known by the mystical term of "vision de gloire." But this illumination is not immediate contemplation of the Divine but only a means provided by God and raising the soul to intuitive vision. The light "lumière de gloire" is created and as such, distinct from the uncreated Light which is God Himself. Consequently in the state of "lumière de gloire" man does not contemplate God immediately but remains within the limits of the created world (at any rate that is how we understand this teaching). v. Michel. *Intuitive (vision)—Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Col. 2370—cf. Guichardon, *Le problème* . . . p. 102. Having admitted that "Dieu est essentiellement lumière incréée," he maintains further on that "on considère la lumière de gloire comme un secours accordé par Dieu . . . en ce sens la lumière de gloire est donc une lumière créée reçue dans l'intelligence qu'elle perfectionne."

⁵⁹ Th. Uspenski, *Synodik*, p. 38.

⁶⁰ For analogous expressions on divine beauty see notes 28, 30, etc.

⁶¹ The question of Gregory's place and rôle in the general line of development of Orthodox theology could form the subject of a separate thesis. The present chapter does not pretend to be a full analysis and merely formulates general ideas which need to be developed and grounded in fact. No student of "Palamism" has yet produced such a work. This is partly due to the confessional prejudice to which we refer in the text of this chapter and which has made the scientific setting of the problem very difficult.

⁶² The complete traditionalism of Gr. Palamas is insisted upon by earlier Orthodox apologetic authors who, however, do not examine the substance of his work and particularly emphasise his antipathy for and struggle against Catholicism, whereas this formed a comparatively unimportant part of his activity and doctrine. Prof. Papamichail expresses similar views in his work on Gr. Palamas (v. note in January E.C.Q.) On the other hand Catholic writers both old and new (Jugie and especially Guichardon) represent Gregory as a pure "innovator" and consequently "heretic." Jugie writes of him: "Il inventa une théologie que réprouve la philosophie et la théologie chrétienne la plus élémentaire" (*Palamas*, col. 1742), and calls his teaching "théologie nouvelle inouïe jusque là," (ibid. col. 1738). In other parts of his work, however, Jugie softens his judgment of the novelty of Gregory's teaching and finds in him a certain similarity with earlier mystical and theological currents. F. Guichardon limits this likeness to his mysticism and sees in the rest of his work nothing but novelty and invention: "Aucun père n'a professé avant lui sa doctrine ni aucun théologien Oriental. Palamas ne représente pas du tout les pères orientaux, ni les pères Byzantins en particulier . . . Le seul courant qui ait influencé Palamas est le courant mystique." (op. c., pp. 119, 121). This bold statement is put forward by Guichardon without any proofs and he does not think it necessary to say what had been the teaching of the Eastern fathers on the subjects treated by Palamas.

Instead of this he expounds in detail the corresponding teaching of Catholic scholasticism—a thing interesting in itself but plainly irrelevant. The one-sidedness of Guichardon's view in this matter is noticed by another Catholic writer, F. V. Grümel, who reviews him (v. note 1); "on ne découvre rien chez Palamas qui permette de croire qu'il ait emprunté sa doctrine à quelque devancier. Quant à avancer sans atténuation qu'aucun théologien Oriental ne l'a professé avant lui, c'est peut-être aller un peu loin." *Echos d'Orient* 1935, No. 177, p. 89.

⁶³ Guichardon insists in his books that Gregory's teaching arose out of the need to find arguments against Barlaam (op. c., pp. 74–77). Yet there can be no doubt that Gregory expressed his fundamental ideas on the Light, on deification, on Divine substance before the beginning of the Barlaamite controversy. (Word on the Presentation, v. note 51 in April E.C.Q. On the date of the Word on the Presentation see Patriarch Philotheus in his *Life of Gr. Palamas*—P.G. 151, 581 C. Jugie supposes it to have been first delivered on Nov. 21, 1331, v. Jugie, *Palamas*, col. 1747.

⁶⁴ Such is the opinion of Guichardon, v. note 59.

⁶⁵ Gregory quotes particularly often from the works of SS. Athanasius of Alexandria, Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor and John Damascene and (among ascetic writers) from B Macarius of Egypt, Diadochus and John Climacus.

⁶⁶ The numerous quotations from the holy fathers do not trouble Guichardon in his defence of the thesis of the novelty of the "Palamite" teaching. He often evades the difficulty by maintaining that Gregory falsified the texts of the holy fathers: "Les citations sur lesquelles il se fonde, si elles lui prêtent un appui verbal, sont faussées." (Guichardon, *Le problème* . . . pp. 119 and 83). As Guichardon brings no proof in support of this statement we do not propose to devote any further attention to it.

⁶⁷ On hesychasm v. note 2 in January E.C.Q.

⁶⁸ We have in mind chiefly their controversial composition against Eunomius (P.G. 29, 497–775 and 45, 248–1122) and some dogmatic epistles on the Blessed Trinity such as the one to Eustaphius (*περὶ τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος*.—P.G. 32, 684–694) to Avlavius (*Περὶ τοῦ μὴ οἰεσθαι λέγειν τρεῖς Θεούς*.—45, 115–136) and to Brother Gregory or to Peter (*Περὶ διαφορὰς οὐσίας καὶ ὑποστάσεων*.—P.G. 32, 325–340).

⁶⁹ It would be interesting to examine the problem of the sources of Gregory's teaching and of the influence over him of diverse philosophical systems. From the formal terminological point of view the most notable is the influence of Aristotle (probably partly through St. John Damascene). The term "*ἐνέργεια*" so frequently met in Gr. Palamas has an Aristotelian origin (v. word *Energie* in *Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe* von D. Rudolf Eisler, 4 Aufl. Berlin 1927–1930. *Ibid.* word *Wesen*—*οὐσία* etc.). The terms *προσόν* (attribute), *συμβεβηκός* (accident), *ιδίωμα* (property), category, etc., used by Gregory have a clearly Aristotelian character. Yet the likeness between Gregory Palamas and Aristotle remains terminological and in substance Gregory is nearer to the Platonic current of thought. There is a Platonic tendency in Gregory's whole struggle against the nominalist interpretation of divine energies and attributes as mere human notions. There is also a certain similarity between the Platonic theory of ideas and Gregory's teaching on the divine energies (in spite of obvious differences). It is therefore difficult to admit Jugie's view (*Theolog. dogm.* p. 104) that there is a certain Aristotelianism (in substance, not only in expression); and a similarity with the Aristotelian "*actus purus*" in Gregory's teaching on God as pure Energy without any potentiality, since, as is correctly noted by F. Sergius Bulgakov, although for Gr. Palamas "energy is God," the converse is not true: we cannot say that God is energy because "He possesses an unknown transcendental substance;" S. Bulgakov, *Kupina Neopalimaia*, Paris 1927, p. 249. As for the rest, Jugie's philosophical characterisation

of Gr. Palamas is fairly correct (v. op. c., pp. 103-105). We must only keep in mind that any such characterisation must remain somewhat relative and inexact. The teaching of Gr. Palamas (like all Christian dogma in general) is difficult to fit into a philosophical framework and his whole spirit is mystical and theological rather than philosophical. Therefore it is inexact to see in the hesychastic disputes of the fourteenth century merely a philosophical controversy and the echo of the ancient struggle between Byzantine Aristotelians and Platonists (as is the opinion of Th. Uspenski in his *Essays on the History of Byzantine Culture*). The works of F. S. Bulgakov contain interesting though somewhat fragmentary statements on the teaching of Gr. Palamas (e.g., *Kupina Neopalimaia* p. 136-7, 212, 249-50, 285-6; *Ikona i Ikonopochtanie*, Paris 1931, pp. 54, 82, 95, 100). Yet we cannot agree with Bulgakov as to the similarity of his teaching on St. Sophia with Gregory's teaching on the Divine energies (v. *Kupina Neopalimaia* p. 288 "in its inner meaning the teaching of Gr. Palamas on the divine energies also belongs to the doctrine of Divine Wisdom"). F. Bulgakov himself admits that "to establish this connection a special study would be needed" (ibidem), which, to our regret, he has not yet produced. But, from the outset, there appears to us a substantial difference between the two. Thus Gregory definitely rejects all passivity in God whereas Bulgakov often speaks of the passive "feminine" principle in Him, seeing it either in the Third Hypostasis or in the St. Sophia in its relation to the Three-hypostatic God. Further, in Bulgakov, Wisdom possesses a somewhat hypostatic character (although of course it is not a fourth hypostasis) whereas in Gr. Palamas the energies are not hypostatic and not autonomous, etc. Therefore it seems to us very difficult to speak of an inner similarity between the two doctrines.

⁷⁰ Some Catholic writers (Jugie, *Palamas*, col. 1814-16, *Theol. dogm.* pp. 175-9 and particularly Guichardon, *Le Problème* . . . p. 171) attempt to prove that the Russian Orthodox Church (in contrast to the Greek) ceased to honour Gr. Palamas as a saint already in the eighteenth century. This strange assertion, the incorrectness of which is evident to anyone acquainted with the spirit and history of the Russian Church, is based by them on the fact that the new rubrics for the Week of Orthodoxy compiled by Bp. Gabriel of Tver in 1766 and adopted since then in the Russian Church leaves out the name of Gr. Palamas as also those of his opponents Barlaam and Akindin (the latter from the list of anathematized heretics). "C'était le rejet sans phrases de l'hérésie Palamite" comments on this Guichardon (op. c., p. 171). Guichardon's conclusion might have been justified if the change in the lists had concerned only Gr. Palamas and his opponents; but in reality the new Ritual left out all names of defenders of Orthodoxy as such and of their opponents and substituted more general anathemas of definite heresies. This new Ritual does not mention either St. Athanasius the Great or St. Cyril of Alexandria and leaves out the names of Arius, Nestorius, etc. To be consistent Guichardon ought to maintain that from the eighteenth century onwards the Russian Church changed its attitude towards these. Finally F. Guichardon omits to mention that the Russian Church, like all other Orthodox Churches, yearly celebrates the feast of Gr. Palamas on the 2nd Sunday in Lent. For details v. A. Petrovski, *Anathema. Orthodox Theological Encyclopaedia* 1 (1900), p. 679-700.

ROME TO-DAY AND REUNION WITH THE EAST

THIS article tries to outline a few of the main tendencies and methods discernible in contemporary Catholic striving for the reunion of eastern Dissidents. The desires and official 'mind' of the Church as regards eastern rites are clearly expressed in papal documents, especially of the last half-century; and to-day these principles and desires are finding expression in numerous forms of apostolate *pro Oriente*. I shall not attempt to catalogue these works: it seems more profitable to select and emphasise some striking features in the movement which rae of special interest for both Catholics and non-Catholics.

But the present position should be viewed in historical perspective. Let it be clear from the outset that there is little either of theory or of practice in this whole field of work for reunion which is essentially new. There is novelty of degree, but not of kind, in the thoroughness and efficiency with which the desires of the Popes are being carried out; the same is true of the extent of present labours for the reunion of the East in almost every country and in so many orders and congregations. That is, there has been considerable development, but small alteration; and development especially in organisation and discipline.¹ In her fundamental position with regard to variety of rite and the Dissident Churches Rome has not changed at all: even in disciplinary matters she has changed very little. Papal and conciliar pronouncements from the time of Nicholas I and Photius to that of the present Pope² show a striking consistency in their reverence and respect for the rites and usages of the Eastern Churches, and their insistence on the presentation of these rites in their integrity: disciplinary mistakes have been made, but they have usually been the mistakes of local prelates or superiors who acted either from ignorance or from

¹ The evolution of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church is an interesting example of such development. (Its history is given in outline in the *Motu proprio* of April 25th last, *Sancta Dei Ecclesia*).

² A number of quotations, with references, from the chief of these documents up to 1908 are given in Adrian Fortescue's *The Uniate Eastern Churches*, pp. 29-43. The more important documents after that date are the *Motu proprio Dei Providentis* (1917), *A.A.S.*, IX, p. 530, the *Motu proprio Orientis Catholicis* (1917), *A.A.S.*, IX, p. 531, the Encyclical *Ecclesiam Dei* (1923), *A.A.S.*, XV, p. 579, the Encyclical *Rerum Orientalium* (1928), *A.A.S.*, XX, p. 277, and the *Motu proprio Sancta Dei Ecclesia* (printed in *L'Osservatore Romano* for May 8th, 1938).

prejudice in a sense contrary to Rome's express desires.¹ Any exclusive Latinism is quite opposed to Christian tradition; and the Popes are nothing if not traditional. The dominance of eastern rites in the first centuries is a commonplace of Church history, though certainly one to which many Latins advert in a merely "notional" fashion: for it should not be without present significance for us to remember that the Liturgy celebrated in Rome at least till the end of the second century was a Greek one, that in the first seven centuries after St. Peter's death there were more than twenty eastern popes, that towards the end of this period Pope Vitalian, with the largeness of spirit appropriate to a great apostolic age like his or ours, sent a Greek monk² to be Archbishop of Canterbury—he was to become one of our English Bishop-Saints. The case of St. Theodore shows that even the idea of priests labouring for the extension of Christ's Mystical Body in a rite other than that of their birth and upbringing is not without precedent. Later, from the sixteenth century onwards, the plan of westerners adopting eastern rites was several times put forward, chiefly by priests or bishops in eastern Europe. Peter Skarga († 1612) was the first to advocate change of rite for workers in Poland, but without immediate fruit.³ For those missionaries in the Far East who had the theological and practical insight to realise that Latin forms and a West-European culture might not be the best mediums for bringing Christ to eastern peoples, the most that was finally authorised was the adoption of an Indian way of life and ritual customs by such men as the 'sannyasin,' Robert de Nobili, and their successors. Although here the parallel is not complete, anyone who understands the holy purpose, sincerity, and entire lack of "policy"

¹ As the *Motu proprio Sancta Dei Ecclesia* puts it: "Si nonnulli, nimio unitatis concordiaeque amore compulsi, cum non satis Orientalium res atque indolem cognoscerent, vel sacros eorum ritus corrumpere vel eos ad latinum ritum redigere enisi sunt, at Romani Pontifices, decessores Nostri, hisce nisibus pro facultate, nullisque parcendo laboribus, obstiterunt."

² St. Theodore is said to have been a native of Tarsus. He was educated partly at Athens, and had lived all his life among the Greeks. Though sixty-five years old (G. Schnürer says he was seventy) at the time of his appointment to the see of Canterbury, he was not yet a subdeacon (like the majority of the Latins who to-day receive permission to transfer to an eastern rite).

³ Later, others in Poland, Lithuania and Rumania also petitioned Rome for permission to make a change of rite. The Holy Office finally answered: "Ex hactenus deductis non videtur concedenda esse facultas." In view of the general lack of realisation in those European "mission fields" of how important it was to preserve the eastern rites in their purity, and in view too of the undoubted Latinising tendency at that date of many authorities and missionaries, the refusal seems to have been a mercy of Providence.

in de Nobili's work will have little difficulty in comprehending what modern westerners are about when they become priests of an eastern rite.

If the historical background is important for those who would see truly the Church's present work for reunion, a clear understanding of her dogmatic position is even more necessary. Reticence in this matter has not helped to dissipate the considerable ignorance that exists in certain quarters : and ignorance of what Catholic dogma means will continue to lead even the best-intentioned of non-Catholics to formulæ as remote from the realities of the situation as these of the Anglican Commission on Christian Doctrine : " With regard to the Church of the future, some of us look forward to a reunion of Christendom having its centre in a Primacy such as might be found in a Papacy which had renounced certain of its present claims . . ."¹ It is in fact an impossibility for reunion to come by means of a Papacy which had renounced any of its dogmatic claims regarding its Primacy or the Church which obeys it ; by their very nature, the Papacy can never abdicate these claims. Briefly, and merely as a frank and necessary statement of fact, the Church's dogmatic position—which must ever be the *point du départ* of all her work for reunion—is as follows. Christ, the Incarnate Word, founded one true visible Church on earth which He willed to continue to the end of time infallible, essentially unchangeable and visibly one. The Catholic Church in union with the see of Rome is this one true Church. It is further Christ's explicit will that all men should be gathered into the one fold of His Church : therefore it is the business of the shepherds of that fold to do all in their power to bring into it all mankind, all nations and every individual. Now at no moment of history have all Christians in communion with Rome celebrated in the Latin rite, and difference of rite within the Church has always been admitted and approved. Moreover, at the present time there is a body of Catholic Orientals corresponding to every dissident group, while there are no dissident Maronites. But the vast majority of Christians of most eastern rites, amounting in all to more than two hundred million souls, are not in visible union with the Church : and it is part of Christ's commission to the Church that they be brought into union. However, the Church wishes neither to anticipate Providence nor to ram her dogmas down the throats of those not of her communion : throughout their clear directions and pronouncements on eastern questions the present-day Popes have emphasised the fact that their first desire is for the Catholic

¹ *Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine*, p. 126. (1938).

West as a whole to come to know intimately and sympathise with the Christian East; they beg that dissident Orientals will strive in return to understand and sympathise with western and eastern Catholics. The many forms of Catholic activity for the reunion of the East may all be said to be directed towards these ends.

It is of first importance for both Dissidents and Catholics to understand once and for all that these works, so far from tending to latinisation, are definitely opposed to it. The papal pronouncements on the inviolability of eastern rites and discipline have been often quoted and are well known. From the principle that "the Church of Christ is neither Latin nor Greek nor Slav, but Catholic,"¹ it follows that the Popes and Catholic Bishops must "cherish and honour [the Orientals], maintaining their customs and rites as much as we are able with the Lord's help"²; that priests "shall not dare to persuade anyone . . . to pass from the Greek to the Latin rite, or shall even allow them to do so if they wish it, without having first consulted the Apostolic See";³ that Latins who despise the Byzantine rite are gravely at fault⁴; and that the intense desire of the Holy See remains always this, "that all men should be Catholics, but not that all should become Latins."⁵ In view, however, of the fact that mediæval and later pronouncements against latinisation too often remained a dead letter, what is to be noted is that in our own time the desires of the Popes are being carried out with a very high degree of loyalty and fidelity, at least by those directly in contact with oriental Christians.⁶ Those westerners who have passed from the Latin to an oriental rite are among the most scrupulous in preserving their eastern rite in its purity: the most exacting critics will

¹ Benedict XV, *Motu proprio Dei Providentis*, 1917.

² Fourth Lateran Council, *Mansi*, xxii, 989 (ref. from Fortescue).

³ Benedict XIV, *Demandatum calitus*, 1743: this was addressed to the Melchites. Leo XIII reiterated the same warning in *Orientalium dignitas*, 1894.

⁴ So Leo X (†1521) and Clement VII (†1574); so, in our own time, Benedict XV and Pius XI.

⁵ Benedict XIV, *Allatae sunt*, 1755: "Exoptans vehementer . . . ut omnes Catholici sint, non ut omnes Latini fiant."

⁶ In certain western countries there has also been a good response to the present Holy Father's desire for an increased knowledge of the Christian East among clergy and faithful, by the training of seminary professors and by "oriental days" in seminaries and colleges. In others the response has not been so good: *Rerum Orientalium* asked every bishop in the world to choose at least one of his priests for special oriental studies, and drew the attention of all to the Oriental Institute in Rome: one knows the great shortage of men in England even for what may be judged much more urgent work, but it remains a matter for regret that in the ten years since this encyclical appeared not one English priest seems to have followed the courses of the Institute.

find no trace of "latinisation" in the Greek and Slavonic Liturgies and Slavonic Office at Amay, or in the ceremonies at the Russian Catholic Church of St. Anthony in Rome.¹ Indeed, it is largely owing to eastern priests of Latin origin and to Latin priests working in the Near East that the self-latinising tendency of certain Catholic Orientals is being overcome. That turn in "the mystery of events" which has left the Latin rite enormously predominant in numbers over a period of many centuries led, through the ignorance and "western haughtiness" or snobbery of certain Latins, and the equal ignorance and snobbery of Orientals in union with Rome, to an unfortunate inferiority complex on the part of many of these eastern Catholics. The result was a partial aping of Latin customs and ritual, often fostered by Latin authorities. To-day, when so many Latin priests and seminarists have counted it a privilege to be allowed to adopt for life an oriental rite, that they may labour for and in the Christian East, and when eastern clergy and eastern liturgies hold a permanent place of honour in the ecclesiastical life of Rome itself,² both Latins and Orientals are beginning to learn that the true Catholic attitude among those of different rites is one of mutual love, respect and interest, without the faithful of one rite either imitating or despising the ritual customs and traditions of any other rite.³

This is not to pretend that the situation is yet ideal. The weaning of the vast majority of Latin Catholics from their exclusively "West-European outlook" will not be the work of a few years, nor of one generation. The cast of mind common to many a modern Latin priest and certain seventeenth century theologians dies hard. Nor is it easy to educate some Catholic Orientals out of a deplorable shamefacedness with regard to their rite. But, in face of both present and past abuses, one should always remember Pius XI's appeal several years ago, that "dissident Orientals

¹ At present the majority of the oriental clergy at both these centres originally belonged to the Latin rite.

² It is worth remembering that at Rome, in an average period of ten years, some twelve to fifteen thousand professors, biennists and students of all nations come into direct contact with priests and seminarists of various oriental rites. At the Jesuit scholasticate there, during the past six years, a total of about six hundred philosophers and theologians from all over the world have had living and studying with them fellow-Jesuits of the Russian, Greek and Rumanian rites; since 1933 a Byzantine Liturgy has been daily celebrated in the house, and any Latin scholastics who wish may attend.

³ Among certain Latin Catholics, and a few eastern Catholics of western origin, there is a tendency to an exaggerated cult of eastern rites and religious traditions as essentially superior to their Latin equivalents. Any such movement is as ignorant and unbalanced as the previous latinising tendency. The Church of Christ is not Latin: neither is it Slavs

should learn to know the true life of the Church, and not lay to *Her* charge those faults of individual members which She Herself condemns and strives to correct.”¹ In any case, our modern Popes have spoken so clearly and acted so vigorously that “the true life”—the real thinking and willing—of the Church, in the matter of the integrity of eastern rites, must slowly but certainly permeate the minds and hearts of all her children, Latin and Oriental, clerical and lay. One may say, then, that from a negative point of view Catholic oriental rites are sufficiently safeguarded from corruption. But from the positive side, what is equally important and promising is the more widespread realisation of how necessary the eastern rites are for the actual, ‘extensive’ fulness and Catholicity of the Church. Unity is of things which are distinct; reunion does not mean absorption. As Adrian Fortescue noted more than twenty years ago, it is the existence within the Church of bodies of Oriental Christians which gives the lie “to that identification of ‘Roman Catholic’ with ‘Latin,’ which is the great point of [the Anglican] branch theory.” What is more, the history of God’s Providence in the Church requires that her theological and spiritual traditions should descend not only from the Latin West but also from the ancient Catholic Eastern Churches and the great Eastern Fathers, the cradles and the first teachers of our faith; and the mission of the Church makes it proper and desirable, as the Holy Father himself recently noted,² that her public worship of God should reflect the wide range of national and racial temperaments comprehended in her universal catholicity.

If any non-Catholic still feels tempted to subscribe to the old accusation that Catholic activity in the sphere of eastern rites is a plan of “seduction,” a backstairs method for bringing Dissidents to a final latinised uniformity under the rule of Rome,³ further proof of the Church’s wholehearted acceptance of the equality of all rites may be found in her readiness to send Oriental missionaries to work among non-Christian peoples and so establish new bodies of Oriental Catholics. Although it is as yet too early to give details, it

¹ *Ecclesiam Dei*.

² Romanis enim Pontificibus mens est liturgicarum rerum varietatem, quae ex peculiari populorum ingenio atque indole invecata est, non modo sanctae fidei divinique cultus unitati non repugnare, sed eam potius commendatione ac laudibus exornare; quandoquidem ex hoc capite facile eruitur unam eandemque catholicam religionem et omnium vel diversarum gentium naturae ex moribus respondere optime, et uberrimos variaque pulchritudine distinctos edere fructus.”—*Sancta Dei Ecclesia*.

³ Though anyone still thinking along these lines might at least reflect that in so doing he calls into question the probity and sincerity of so venerable a personality as the present Pope.

may be said that missions in an oriental rite among infidels or pagans are no longer a mere possibility, but will be established wherever circumstances make them preferable to Latin missions, as soon as the men are ready. One probable sphere of such work is the Near East, among the Mohammedans. "Ce qu'il faut comprendre," writes a commentator on the situation in Syria, "c'est que l'effort 'musulman' et l'effort 'rituel' [among Maronites, Melchites, and Armenians] se commandent réciproquement, et iront de plus en plus de pair. . . . La question musulmane ne pouvait avancer qu'à l'aide du rite." And he gives the impressions of a highly educated Mohammedan on assisting at an oriental Liturgy. "For the first time since my conversion," the man declared, "I feel really at home and able to pray properly. Here I have found once more what I used to love in my Moslem religion."

The attitude of Rome to the purely ritual features of the Eastern Churches has been dealt with at some length so as fully to reassure those who are doubtful of Catholic sincerity in the matter: but let there be no false emphasis on rite alone,¹ for what is equally insisted on by the Popes is the retention and development of the wider spiritual and cultural traditions of the East. It would be vain for oriental Catholics to preserve their eastern forms of worship if their hearts and minds were to become latinised and Europeanised. It is equally useless for a Latin to change to an oriental rite and put on a cloak of eastern habits if his ways of thinking and feeling are set iron-hard in Latin and western grooves. "You cannot pass from one rite to the other by a mere change of rubrics," writes an Englishman of the Byzantine-Slavonic rite;² another once compared the process of leaving the Roman rite to that of "getting out of one's skin." The Holy Father, in one of his first instructions on the subject, wrote that the "appropriate studies" for men who are to devote themselves to the cause of reunion will be "the languages [which also implies literature,] history, ways of life, character, and above all, theology and liturgies" of eastern peoples.³ As the religious culture of the largest

¹ Though for the Orientals themselves rite is much more intimately bound up with spiritual life and culture than is usually the case with Latins.

² J. H. Ryder, S.J., "Western Missioners in Eastern Rites," *Dublin Review*, January, 1938.

³ Letter to Dom Fidele de Stotzingen, March, 1924. The present three years' course of studies at the Oriental Institute includes such subjects as comparative western and Orthodox theology, oriental patrology and Church History, eastern liturgies, eastern languages, eastern Canon Law, ascetical and mystical theology of the East, eastern monasticism, archaeology, and Latin and oriental paleography.

groups of Oriental Christians owes much in its origins to Byzantium, mature, and half opposed to the "barbarian" West, long before King Alfred began to teach our English parish priests to read and write, with an art whose golden age (843-1204) was at an end—though for several centuries more it bore rich fruit in the partly derivative art of Russia—when the western art which it gave suck to was still young; as this more ancient Christian culture has developed, during the centuries since the separation, along lines for the most part remote from the trends of Catholic civilisation in the West; as the religious history of these peoples, it would seem from recent research, will have to be rewritten; and as their theology is rooted deep in the soil of the Eastern Fathers, until recently but little disturbed by modern western theologians, it is plain that a thorough knowledge of the Eastern Churches will not be easily or cheaply come by. But the Pope regards it as extremely important for the cause of reunion that the Church should know more intimately and more deeply reverence the Christian East.¹ In his allocution of December 18, 1924, Pius XI declared that three conditions are essential if the work of reconciliation is to have any hope of success: first, the majority of Catholics must rid themselves of their false outlook with regard to the doctrines and institutions of the Eastern Churches; secondly, there must be a comparative study of Eastern and Latin Patrology, to see how all the Fathers agree in one and the same faith; finally, the exchange of opinions between East and West must be in a spirit of brotherly charity. On another occasion he gave it as his opinion that the failures of previous attempts at reunion have been largely due to ignorance on both sides.² In 1928, *Rerum Orientalium* recommended oriental studies to the whole Catholic world, asking bishops to see to it that their clergy be properly instructed in eastern matters. It was in the same year that the Oriental Institute, then just transferred to the new building near St. Mary Major's, was reorganised as part of the Gregorian University,³ that it might be a more efficient instrument in the work of bringing about that intellectual and moral rapprochement of East and West which must precede any final reunion. It will be taken here as the type of works of specialisation and scholarship, because it is the Pope's own institute for oriental studies: one does not for that disregard the valuable work of the same sort being done else-

¹ Cf. *Ecclesiam Dei* (1923).

² Allocution of January 10th, 1927.

³ By the Motu proprio *Quod Maxime*, September 30th, 1928 (*A.A.S.*, XX, p. 309).

where.¹ Under the general heading of "the promotion of higher studies relating to the Christian East" and the education of students working for the Christian East and for reunion,² the end of the Institute covers such works as the following: the preparation of seminary and university professors for faculties of oriental studies; the intellectual formation of Latins, and those of western origin, who are to work among Orientals; the higher education of oriental Catholics, both priests or religious and laymen; helping the studies of dissident Orientals who wish to avail themselves of the facilities of the Institute³; helping those who are working in any lines connected with oriental studies; and the publication of scientific studies which will extend the knowledge and love of the Christian East and explain the Church's attitude towards the Oriental Churches. For the efficient execution of this programme there is a large staff of professors, whose numbers are constantly being added to; for example, an Englishman will begin to profess Greek in October, and among those at present preparing themselves to teach are two new professors of oriental Canon Law. The new Library was opened only in 1930, but its shelves are being rapidly filled and it is already quite rich in certain subjects. It is obvious that Pius XI intends this section of his University to produce men who will be competent both to educate the West towards a more sympathetic understanding of the Christian East and to study and give to the whole Church the treasures of religious truth to be found in the theology, liturgies and traditions of the Dissidents—for "the pieces broken off from a gold-bearing rock are themselves gold-bearing."⁴ By their writings the professors of the Oriental Institute add to the scientific data available on oriental questions, and directly influence a wider public than could possibly attend their courses. The two periodicals of the Institute (since 1935) are *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, a scientific quarterly, and *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, an annual reserved for monographs and longer studies. Articles are also published in other journals. Knowledge of the East is spread among the faithful of Italy by means of the

¹ For example, the historical researches of Dvornik, Grunel, Jugie and others on eastern "schisms" and the doubtful œcumenicity of one or more of the Councils may be of pivotal importance in the whole work of reunion.

² *Statuta*, I, De Institutis Natura et Fine, Art. 3.

³ There are three grades of students: "ordinary students" following a planned course of study usually lasting three years (see note 3 on p. 221), and sitting for the degrees of the Institute; "extraordinary students" who do not intend to sit for degrees; and "guests" who attend certain courses or lectures.

⁴ Pius XI, allocution of January 10th, 1927.

Bibliotheca di piccole guide sull' Oriente cristiano. The proper work of the Institute, however, is not one of popularisation, but of specialisation, as a university where Catholics and Dissidents may make their oriental studies together, and where experts may be trained who are to teach others, or who will act as liaison-officers in the work of reunion. But if reunion is to come, such envoys must be able to go out to oriental Christians as the genuine representatives of the Catholic West: if they appear merely as isolated enthusiasts, they can do little or nothing to dissipate the prejudices of the Dissidents against an unsympathetic, uncomprehending, Catholic majority. Nor is it to be presumed that the prayers, desires and labours of a handful of men will avail to lift the dead weight of prejudice left by centuries of uncharity, apathy and hostility on the part of whole nations of both West and East, and win for mankind "the immense grace of reconciliation."

Hence the incalculable importance of educating the rank and file of the Catholic West to think and feel with the Popes in the matter of the Eastern Churches. The work for reunion must become as much or more the effort and preoccupation of all the faithful as are already the foreign missions. And as with the foreign missions any material help given by the faithful is of moment, but it is their love of other men's souls, expressed in Christian and prayerful lives, that missionaries rely on as the profounder force behind any success they may achieve, so will it be with the work for reunion: that supernatural charity and deep mutual sympathy throughout East and West, which the Holy Father has declared to be the fundamental pre-requisite for reunion, will, when we have achieved it, be the chief operative power on man's side in any extension of the visible fulness of the Mystical Body. But these dispositions of charity and sympathy can be prepared and fostered only by the propagation of clear and accurate knowledge. Let us deal first of all with the West, where such propaganda is comparatively easy, since it means no more than the carrying out of the earnest desires of the Holy See. Pius XI has himself made several practical recommendations. He has more than once stressed the necessity of "detailed teaching of the doctrine of the Orientals and of the cognate sacred sciences to the students of Latin universities and seminaries":¹ the clergy above all must not be ignorant of eastern questions, and the Pope's aim is to have a fully trained professor of oriental studies in every seminary of the world. Another suggestion of His Holiness is that "Eastern Days" be held regularly in seminaries and colleges,

¹ Allocution of December 18th, 1927.

a plan faithfully carried out, with much fruit, in several countries of Europe. Where possible an oriental Liturgy is one of the main features of such a day, and may be anticipated by an explanatory talk on the previous evening. At Berchmanskolleg near Munich the philosophers have at least twice turned themselves into a Slavonic Choir for the actual celebration of the Liturgy. Seminarists or schoolboys will not always be ready for the persevering labour implied in such a performance as this, but some among them will generally be pleased enough to organise an oriental exhibition,¹ design and print a programme, and perhaps even prepare the talk or lantern-lecture which usually rounds off the day. Such Eastern Days do not seem to happen so frequently in England: but there as elsewhere the last few years have seen a good deal of instruction of Latin Catholics, priests and nuns as well as layfolk, who, by assisting at the Liturgy in parish churches and convent chapels and listening to the sermons and conferences of priests of the Byzantine Rite, are being made aware of the existence of a Catholicism which is the same as their own, but neither Latin nor western. The quiet but most effective propaganda of Amay through their reproductions of Greek and Russian eikons, so rich in theological content and un-western in their artistic forms, has a precisely similar effect. Already, in England, France, Germany, Holland and Italy associations of layfolk and priests have been founded, to assist the cause of reunion by prayer, study, propaganda and material help;² and ten or more periodicals³ now published in Western Europe and America have it as their explicit aim to interest their readers in work for reunion throughout the world, and especially in questions affecting the Eastern Churches: several of them undertake in addition the delicate task of explaining Catholicism to the eastern Dissidents.

¹ Materials for an exhibition such as "Holy Russia—'Godless' Russia" will usually not be too hard to find. It would be easier still to imitate the boys of Notre Dame de Mont-Roland, at Dôle, who last year constructed a large model of a Byzantine eikonostasis, learning a good deal about the Liturgy in the process. A brochure of the Benedictine monks of Amay-sur-Meuse, Belgium, states that "les moines d'Amay sont disposés à seconder ces journées par tous les moyens."

² *Unio Catholica* in Germany, in Italy *Pro Oriente Christiano*, in England the Society of St. John Chrysostom, *Apostolaat der Kerkvereeniging* in Holland; and in France *L'Oeuvre d'Orient*—which collects three million francs a year.

³ In America, *Chrysostom* and *The Voice of the Church*; in Belgium, *Irénicon*; in England, *THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*; in France, *Echos d'Orient*, *Russie et Chrétienté*, and *L'Unité de l'Eglise*; in Italy, *Pro Oriente Christiano*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*.

It is works directed towards this last end—the bringing of the dissident East to a profounder, more sympathetic knowledge of the Catholic Church—which are most likely to be misunderstood by both Orthodox and Catholics. The latter should make it quite clear to themselves that hardly any of the Dissidents can be accounted formal schismatics (the Holy Father is always careful to avoid the term); it is doubtful how many can justly be called heretics: the great mass of the faithful, adhering firmly to the same Creed as oriental Catholics, are certainly little preoccupied with the theological differences between West and East. It should further be remembered that in working among Orthodox Christians one is usually not dealing with people who still search for the pearl of faith, nor even with men who, while believing more or less as Catholics believe and using Catholic forms of worship, have good reason to seek a better authority than self for their creed and to doubt the validity of their sacrifice. An Orthodox—his very name proclaims the fact—has at least as full an assurance of being in possession of the true faith as a Latin Catholic. It may seem to him that there is little or nothing to gain by reunion with Rome, and much to lose, including the perfection of his very nationality. When Pius XI once remarked that the mistaken and distorted views of some of our separated brethren about the Catholic Church appear “incredible,” he was not using too strong a word. But it is the same Pope who believes that, once the Dissidents come to know the Church as she is, all their prejudices will vanish. The work, then, of those in direct contact with Orthodox will be to do all in their power to show to them the true life of their Church, both in the past, in her history and in her Saints, and in the present. It will be plain that the spirit of controversy, “which would submit our mutual differences on such vital and intimate matters to the crude and inconclusive arbitrament of trial by combat,”¹ has no place here at all. Rather should the would-be apostle of reunion enter into controversy with himself, to discover what obstacles there are in him to that “transparence,” in the sense of Fr. Pzywara, which must be his if the beauty of Catholicism is to be made manifest through him to dissident Christians.

Personal contact with Catholics is now of course a daily circumstance in the lives of many Russian Orthodox of the emigration. It is interesting to note that in Rome itself, where there is a small colony of some two hundred and fifty Russian Orthodox and about fifty Russian Catholics, relations between the two groups are most cordial; some of

¹ R. H. J. Steuart, S.J., in *The Tablet*, 1938, pp. 728–9.

the Orthodox are often present at services in the Catholic Russian Church, or at the conferences held on the first Sunday of each month in the Russian College. But the types of organised Catholic work for enabling Dissidents to come to know and understand the Church can best be illustrated by the examples of the Benedictine Priory of Amay-sur-Meuse and the Internat Russe St. Georges at Namur. The latter was founded in Constantinople in 1921, and transferred to Namur two years later. It is a College for Russian boys who want a good secondary education that is both Christian and Russian, by way of preparation, in many cases, for higher studies. At Namur the boys live in the pleasant and up-to-date Internat in the Avenue Reine Astrid, attending the ordinary classes at the nearby College of Notre Dame de la Paix. Special classes in Russian and English are given at St. Georges itself, where, as a general rule, the boys are also obliged to talk in Russian. (Most of them are more fluent in French, and several can hardly speak Russian at all. Others are quite fluent in Russian, but have had no practice in reading and writing). In other respects, too, everything possible is being done to help the boys to retain something of their national and cultural traditions, while they prepare themselves for a professional career in Europe. In every room at St. Georges you will find the "Holy Corner" with its eikons and lamp, to which the boys turn for prayers before and after meals and studies; there are Russian dances, a Russian choir, a Russian balalaika orchestra—and a Byzantine chapel where the boys assist at the Divine Liturgy in their own rite and are taught how to serve it. Of some five hundred boys who have studied at St. George's Russian College in the past fifteen years, many are already doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, priests. Others are completing their studies at one of the Belgian universities, especially at Louvain, where there are special arrangements to enable boys from St. Georges to continue there. And the value of this College from the point of view of reunion? It is chiefly this: practically every one of these old boys, many of whom came to St. Georges with strong anti-Catholic prejudices, founded on imperfect knowledge, have left with a real respect and even affection for the Catholic priests who have directed the Institute, and for their Catholic professors at Notre Dame de la Paix; there is often a similar change of attitude on the part of Orthodox parents who send their boys to Namur. Catholic Russian boys are safeguarded from latinisation, brought into friendly contact with Orthodox fellow-Russians from all over Europe, and given an equal opportunity of preparing themselves for

a liberal career. Now many of these young men will afterwards exert great influence in Russian circles, and it will go for much towards that reunion which both Orthodox and Catholics keenly desire that these future leaders have from their boyhood been sympathetically disposed, the one group towards their Orthodox fellow-countrymen, the other towards the Catholic Church.

About twenty-three miles down the Meuse from Namur, the Byzantine and Latin monks of the Benedictine Priory of Amay are doing all in their power to fulfil one of the special purposes for which their house was founded, that of giving hospitality to oriental Christians, both dissident and Catholic, and especially to Russians.¹ Such work, though not patient of statistical analysis, may none the less be one of the most fruitful, like the same monks' equally unspectacular apostolate of prayer. The bi-ritual character of the Priory makes it a centre where both eastern and western Christians can study each other's forms of worship. It is as yet the only monastery in the world where one can daily attend at choice either the Roman or the Byzantine Office and Liturgy: guests of the Roman or of an eastern rite find there a Catholic monasticism which expresses itself with equal readiness in either, and there they meet Catholic monks of all nations who, whether Byzantine or Latin, are perfectly familiar with the culture and traditions of the Christian East. And the growing number of eastern Dissidents who are interested in the liturgy of the West will be able, at Amay, to study it in an atmosphere of the greatest possible understanding and friendliness.

Now it may seem that the success of this whole work of making Catholic life and practice better known to the Dissidents depends on the good will, interest and sincere desire for truth on the part of the latter. This is true, but it is not the complete truth: for many will be attracted or repelled just in so far as they find or fail to find in the Church those treasures of the Christian inheritance which they themselves most value. The more closely all her rites, peoples, nations, social classes and individuals are integrated together in the Catholic Church in the bonds of supernatural charity, the more fully and purely the Church's spiritual and liturgical traditions are developed, the easier will it be for eastern Christians to see in her the one true Bride of Christ she claims to be. It is surely more than coincidence that the present Pope, whose desire it is that the distinctive mark of his pontificate be work for reunion, should have striven hardest to

¹ "Slavos ex Russia apud nos exsultantes omni caritatis officio prosequantur." Pius XI.

bring about the achievement of precisely those aims which will most affect the Orthodox: social justice and charity, the sense of the solidarity of the human race, the spiritual overthrow of atheistic communism, the study of the Holy Scriptures and of the Fathers, the recognition of the sanctity of marriage, the safeguarding of Christian civilization by the proper education of youth, a holy priesthood respected by the faithful, and the re-establishment in the West of a corporate Liturgy. Many of the things the Holy Father has said about the Liturgy—for example, that the faithful “should not be merely detached and silent spectators” but should “actively participate in divine worship,” and that “there is a close connection between dogma and the sacred Liturgy, between Christian worship and the sanctification of the faithful”¹—utterances which restore to western Christendom a tradition largely neglected or forgotten, would come as commonplaces to many a peasant of oriental rite. Western Catholics who are still apathetic in these matters may at least be interested to learn that dissident leaders of eminence look to the liturgical and patristic revival in the West as one of the brightest hopes for future reunion. Any fruitful development of eastern traditions among the Church’s small bodies of oriental Catholics will also have a profound effect on Dissidents of the same rites. The rise and growth of the Studites of Galicia, a flourishing Catholic Congregation of eastern monks, has already made a considerable impression. The end of this Congregation since the post-War years, when it was practically re-founded, is both contemplative and active; the nature of its monasticism is strictly oriental. In about fifteen years the number of monks increased from twelve to two hundred; but although there is a steady stream of new aspirants there has been hardly any fresh increase in the last four or five years, because of the large number who find the life too severe and leave before their profession. There is a “postulancy” of six months, followed by a year’s noviceship, at the end of which vows are taken which bind for one year, and so again for a second and a third year. At the end of that time a monk may be professed. Of the two hundred monks about eighty are already professed, and of these more than twenty are priests, six deacons, and several more preparing themselves for the priesthood or diaconate. In accordance with oriental tradition there is no distinction in their way of life between priests and non-priests, and, so far as intellectual capacity and modern requirements permit, any monk can at any time be raised to the priesthood. Besides the central laura there are at present

¹ *Divini Cultus*.

four daughter-monasteries, as well as several smaller houses for missionary work. The life of the Studites is one chiefly of prayer and manual work,¹ in a silence broken only by half-an-hour's recreation after dinner. Seven times a day there is Office, which is chanted in Slavonic according to the strict Synodal usage, though the majority of the monks are of Ukrainian origin. The food is very plain, but not limited in quantity: during the year meat is taken only on Sundays and feasts, and in Lent not at all. At a time when all monasteries on Soviet territory have long ago been disbanded, the spectacle of these Studite monks of Poland devoting themselves to the preservation and development of the monastic traditions of "Holy Russia" is a moving one and it has won the sympathy of many Orthodox.

Most winning of all in the sight of God and men will be the vision of a Church in which Catholics of eastern and western rite and of all nations, with every national and ritual group richly true to itself, are wholly knit together in a supra-ritual, supra-national charity—"that with one mind we may confess the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, the consubstantial and indivisible Trinity."² The aptest preparation within the Church for the reunion of Dissidents of oriental rite will be the perfecting of the unity already substantially complete of oriental and Latin Catholics. It was partly because of "the disputes which readily spring up between the faithful of different rites and discipline"³ that the Holy Father was at pains last April to define and extend the jurisdiction of the Oriental Congregation. A few weeks before, however, the largely infidel territories of Transjordan had witnessed a striking manifestation of unity on the part of the few thousand Melchite and Latin Catholics there. Between March 27th and April 10th, at Hosn and Salt successively, retreats were organised for the sixteen Melchite priests, and the children, women and men of both rites. In each division the Melchites and Latins received the same talks and instructions; on the final day all communicated together, but each according to his own rite. Such unprecedented proofs of unity in Christ were a source of great joy to priests and people; some declared that it was the first time in their lives they had really known the gladness of living like brothers with all their fellow-Catholics. This may seem no more than an isolated incident in an out-

¹ When living in the monastery all must give some time to manual work, even those engaged in studies.

² Words immediately preceding the Creed in the Byzantine Liturgy.

³ "Dissensiones . . . quae inter fideles dissimilium rituum absimilisque disciplinae facile oriuntur"—*Sancta Dei Ecclesia*.

of-the-way land. Whether an isolated incident or a token that the Spirit of Christ is already bringing the City of God to a state of harmony such as must attract within her walls all Christians of every rite and nation, this humble demonstration of unity from the country beyond the Jordan can be a stimulus to Catholics and serve them as a symbol of that final unity "of all the holy Churches of God" for which both Dissidents and Catholics of the Byzantine rite pray to the Holy Trinity in every Liturgy.

P. DICKINSON, S.J.

"THE BROTHERHOOD OF THEOLOGIANS ΣΩΗ" (LIFE)

Σωή is, as its name would imply, the most vital religious movement in Greece at the moment. It is a movement "strictly within the bounds of the Orthodox Church," and is doing much to revivify religious life throughout Greece and the islands and even in Alexandria.

It had its first beginnings in 1907 when the Archimandrite Eusebios Matthopoulos, then a man of sixty, gathered round him four young theological students of whom Mr. P. N. Trembelas, the source of much of the following information, was the oldest. Since that date it has slowly taken root, grown and flourished until now it has about 90 members, has received the approbation of the Holy Synod, which states that it wishes all further religious movements to be modelled on Zoë, and has much influence for good throughout the country.

Fundamentally Zoë is a brotherhood: it lays stress on leading the monastic life and on cultivating the monastic virtues. It emphasises obedience, humility, chastity and self-denial and also instruction. With this solid basis the Brotherhood does much apostolic work, whether as preachers or confessors, by catechetical work, or the printing press.

The majority of its members are theological graduates of Athens University, though others are taken and help in such work as the printing press. Those who are still students work with Zoë and some of the best, but only they, are taken to live at its house. Its members do not take vows but all are unmarried. Zoë's "Leader"—at present Fr. Seraphim Papakosta—is always a priest, and so are some of its members, but they are only "called" to be priests after they have been tested and gained solidity, never early. Zoë has some 17 priests (two ordained this year). Thus

it is chiefly a brotherhood of lay theologians and authorised lay preachers and catechists.

As preachers they are carefully trained. At first, not unnaturally, there was considerable ecclesiastical opposition to lay preachers, but now many are the official metropolitan preachers and sometimes count many bishops amongst their hearers. They are generally recognised and the present writer can witness to the packed congregations (standing throughout) and rapt attention when a "Brother" is preaching. (In Greek congregations, *mirabile dictu*, the men seem to be in the majority). The poor people in the provinces themselves collect money to be able to have a Zoë preacher, and more spontaneous applications of this kind are received than preachers can be supplied.

Zoë also aims at producing confessors, because of the former disuse of confession. It holds that the office requires very special preparation and also that it is one of the most powerful instruments for good: "psychologically," they say, "people are more prepared to receive teaching at confession than in a sermon, because they are there admitting sin and fault."

But Zoë's greatest work is probably its catechetical schools. There are now 311 of these with 41,800 pupils. Some fifty of the "Brothers" remain working from the Athens house in the winter; the rest are scattered, preaching and teaching. All catechists are trained and "passed" by Zoë members, including the women who, with the approval of the bishops, have quite recently been started to teach girls. An excellently planned and graduated series of lessons has been issued by the Zoë press to assist teachers and standardize the teaching, which has resulted in the work being taken up even more widely. It seems to be a popular movement. One class will act as an illustration. It took place in one of the bigger Athens churches on a week-day afternoon, about 5.30, and was entirely voluntary. This was the senior boys' class and there were a very considerable crowd of them, some being, indeed, young men with moustaches! Around the edges stood and sat about half the number again of men and women, old and young. The class was being taken by a priest, not in this instance a member of Zoë, who was going through the whole liturgy explaining it to them with the help of the sacred vessels and veils themselves, and of diagrams on a blackboard. When he had finished speaking one of the senior lay members of Zoë, pointed out to the boys how much better they would understand the Liturgy when next they came, and encouraged them always to go to communion in the Liturgy, every week—that was the proper thing—and to prepare for communion by confession. Before

and after the class the boys sang hymns including a translation of :

“ Holy, holy, holy
Lord God Almighty . . . ”

and said the Our Father and other prayers. Interest was obviously keen. The good being done by these catechetical schools up and down the country is incalculable.

The remaining major activity of Zoë is its printing press, already alluded to, whose chief product is probably the Brotherhood's weekly paper “ΣΩΗ.” This has the, for a religious paper, enormous circulation of 84,000. It is a small paper, clearly printed and in no sense a “news-paper,” but entirely confined to religious matter, and always written by the Brotherhood itself. Its yearly subscription is no more than the equivalent of 1s. 6d. They print in addition a small New Testament at 1s. ; a Septuagint at 4s. ; the three Liturgies with parallel old and modern Greek at considerably less than a shilling ; there are also the catechetical series, many popular books of apologetics, St. Basil's letters in modern Greek, and others. The whole printing machinery is up-to-date ; “Zoë” is printed on a 1926 German roller-press, and there are flat presses for books, handbills, music. It is all installed next to the headquarters—189 Ippokratous—and worked by the Brothers themselves. Down the road is the Zoë bookshop, where the book-binding is also done. A University centre has recently been started.

During the summer the whole Brotherhood is gathered in from its manifold activities for a prolonged retreat at a kind of monastic colony outside Athens, where they have their own chapel and liturgies, and where every Brother is asked to give an account of his work that he may learn increasingly to conform himself to the spirit of the Brotherhood. May it proceed and prosper : one of the finest examples of “Orthodox Action” and an inspiration to “Catholic Action” !

E. J. B. FRY.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

EDITOR'S NOTE.—It is obvious that to give a complete chronicle of events is an impossibility, if only on account of space. We then only attempt to record certain events, some quite short notices, others of considerable length. It is hoped that in this way, together with the information to be found regularly in *News and Comments*, readers will be kept in touch with all the outstanding news connected with the question of the Eastern Churches.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

ROME.

His Eminence Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishop of Westminster, has been appointed to three Congregations, one of them being that of the Eastern Church.

From April 27th till May 1st, 1938, the fifth centenary of the Council of Florence was celebrated at Florence, by holding the fifth Eastern Week of the Italian Reunion Movement, founded five years ago to prepare the way for reunion with the Eastern Churches by mutual understanding and charity.

GERMANY.

It was announced (in *The Tablet* of January 22nd, 1938) that the German Augustinians had founded a study circle on the subject of the Eastern Church under the leadership of Dr. G. Wunderle, Professor at Wurzburg University. It is said to have already published three books on the Eastern Church, Vladimir Soloviev, and on the eikons of Athos.

RUMANIA.

In response to an invitation from the Bishops of the Catholic Rumanians of the Byzantine rite, given by Monsignor Frentiu, Bishop of Oradea, at the inauguration of the Rumanian Pontifical College at Rome, Cardinal Tisserant arrived in Rumania on September 7th, 1937. His Eminence was given an official reception and was also received in audience by the King. During his week's visit, its chief purpose being to open friendly contacts with the Orthodox, His Eminence visited a number of places of interest.

Monsignor Nicolescu, Metropolitan of Fagaras and Alba Julia, in company with representatives of the religious, political and cultural world, presided at Blaj on May 15th, at a meeting held to celebrate the centenary of the great meeting held a hundred years ago by forty thousand Catholic Rumanians, when they assembled on "Liberty Field" to vindicate their rights of freedom of religion and nationality.

On May 8th, 1938, the Assumptionists of the Assumption inaugurated their Institute of Byzantine Studies, which was recently transferred from the Bosphorus to Bucarest, Rumania. The choice of this city was due to its Byzantine libraries and the reputation of its Byzantine scholars.

CATHOLIC ACTION IN BEIRUT.

At the beginning of 1938, Catholic Action was officially established in Beirut. This was inaugurated by a solemn Byzantine Liturgy celebrated by Lord Maximos Sayegh, Melkite Metropolitan. His Eminence Mar Ignatios Gabriel I Cardinal Tappuni, Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, presided at the throne, and His Excellency Mgr. Remi Leprêtre, Apostolic Delegate, was present. The sermon was preached by Mar Ignatios Niubarak, Maronite Archbishop.

In the afternoon was held a study-meeting in the "Aula Magna" of the Jesuit Fathers' University of St. Joseph.

CATHOLIC ARMENIANS.

On October 26th, 1937, died in Beirut Mgr. Awadis Arpiarian, Katholikos-Patriarch of Cicilia, at the age of 82, after a short illness. R.I.P.

At the beginning of December in the same year was held, also in Beirut, a synod of the Catholic Armenian episcopate. His Excellency Mgr. Francis Agagianian, titular bishop of Cumana, was unanimously elected Katholikos-Patriarch of Cicilia, and took the name of Krikor Peter XV. On December 5th he was enthroned in the Maronite Cathedral of St. George in the presence of His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate and of Mar 'Abdallah Khury, representing the Maronite Patriarch.

On December 9th the new Katholikos-Patriarch embarked for Rome, where he received from the Sovereign Pontiff the pallium and confirmation in the patriarchal dignity. After visiting Paris he returned to Beirut on February 7th, 1938.

Mgr. Agagianian was born at Aghalansa in Georgia in 1895. At an early age he was sent to Propaganda College in Rome. After the War he was appointed parish priest in Tiflis (Georgia). Subsequently the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church nominated him Vice-Rector of the Armenian College in Rome, and professor of philosophy and theology at Propaganda. In 1928 he became Consultor of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church and Rector of the Armenian College.

In 1935 he was consecrated bishop and appointed Apostolic Visitor of the Armenian Seminary of Bzummar in the Lebanon.

The Mechitarist Fathers of the Catholic Armenian Monastery of Venice, who two years ago founded an Armenian College in Aleppo, have opened a similar institution in Alexandria, Egypt.

MARONITES.

On April 18th, 1937, died at his residence in 'Aramun, in the Lebanon, Mar Hanna Murad, Maronite Archbishop of Ba'albek. R.I.P.

Mar Elias Risha was appointed Patriarchal Vicar, and at the beginning of October, 1937, was nominated successor to Mar Hanna Murad in the archi-episcopal see of Ba'albek.

APOSTOLIC COMMISSIONER FOR THE MARONITE AND MELKITE MONKS.

After the death of Abbot Benedict Gariador, Apostolic Visitor of the three Melkite Congregations of Basilian monks, and after the visit which took place last year in the three Maronite Antonian Congregations, the Holy See appointed the Right Reverend Abbot Anselm Chibas-Lassalle Apostolic Commissioner for the above-mentioned Maronite and Melkite Congregations, and Dom Nicolas Menez, monk of the Abbey of the Rue de la Source in Paris, was confirmed in his charge of administrator of the Melkite Congregations and assistant of the Apostolic Commissioner. The latter, accompanied by his assistant, made his first official visit to the Melkite Basilian Monastery of the Holy Saviour, and then visited Deir esh-Shir and St. John of Shuwair.

On January 25th, 1938, the Apostolic Commissioner and his assistant visited the monastery of Our Lady of Succour, the mother-house of the Baladite Maronite monks. First was read the decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church which established Abbot Anselm Chibas-Lassalle Apostolic Commissioner. A second decree was then read appointing the Right Reverend Father Basilios Ghanem Superior General of the Baladite Congregation. Then the Apostolic Commissioner with his assistant and the Superior General proceeded to elect the new assistants of the latter, and the decree appointing these was read to the public in the church.

On January 27th, the Apostolic Commissioner visited the monastery of St. Roch, of the Antonian Maronite Congregation and read the decree appointing the new Superiors thereof.

On January 29th, 1938, the Right Reverend Father John Mu'arbis was appointed Superior General of the Aleppine Maronite Congregation.

CATHOLIC MELKITES.

On June 22nd, 1937, was laid the first stone of his new archi-episcopal residence by Lord Maximos Sayegh, Metropolitan of Beirut. On June 5th, 1938, the new Cathedral was consecrated and dedicated to St. John Chrysostom.

On October 26th, 1937, at Damascus, His Blessedness the Patriarch of Antioch, Lord Cyril IX Moghabghab, consecrated Lord Joseph Ma'luf, new Archbishop of Ba'albek (Heliopolis).

Lord Joseph Ma'luf was born at Zabugha in the Matu, Lebanon, on December 20th, 1893, Feast of St. Ignatius the Godbearer. He was baptised and confirmed on January 6th, 1894 (Feast of the Holy Theophanies), receiving the names of Rashid and John.

In 1906 he entered the Seminary of St. Anne in Jerusalem, which he was forced to leave when it was closed during the War. In 1919 he returned to St. Anne's and began his philosophy. In 1920 he joined the Paulist Fathers' Community at Harisa in the Lebanon, and was sent for his novitiate to Maison Carrée, the White Fathers' House at Alger.

On July 20th, 1925, he was ordained priest by Lord Antonios Farradj, Patriarchal Vicar in Damascus, and took the name of Joseph.

THE CONGREGATION OF THE SISTERS OF OUR LADY OF PERPETUAL SUCCOUR.

On account of the prosperity of this young community, the hired house in which they are at present living has become too small, and the foundations of a new house have been laid. The convent is being built near the house of the Paulist Fathers, thanks to the zeal of the latter and that of Lord Maximos Sayegh, and the expenses are being paid by a generous benefactor, Mr. Khalil Qazah.

Two Benedictine Missionary nuns of the Priory of Sainte-Bathilde in Paris arrived at Harisa at the beginning of February, 1938, in order to undertake the formation of the young Congregation of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour.

On May 1st, 1938, four novices, having accomplished their two years of canonical noviceship, pronounced their three-yearly vows before Lord Maximos Sayegh, who also gave the veil to three postulants. At the Holy Liturgy during which the profession took place, were present Lord Basilios

Khury, Metropolitan of Homs, Hama, Yabrud and their dependencies, and Mgr. Adonis Terzariol, a member of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church, who had arrived in Beirut on April 25th, with a view to becoming acquainted with the Eastern communities, especially the Melkite.

On May 18th, 1938, Lord Nicolas Nab'a, Melkite Bishop of Saïda (Sidon), embarked for Budapest in order to represent his Patriarch at the International Eucharistic Congress. On his return journey from Hungary he paid his visit "*ad limina Apostolorum*" to Rome.

THE FIRST MELKITE JESUIT FATHER.

On June 19th, 1938, His Blessedness the Patriarch Lord Cyril IX Moghabghab ordained priest the archdeacon Habib 'Airut, S.J., in the Melkite Cathedral of Cairo, in the presence of a large number of Jesuit Fathers. The ceremony of course took place according to the Byzantine rite, in which the newly-ordained Jesuit Father remains.

CATHOLIC SYRIANS.

On November 7th, 1937, His Eminence Mar Ignatios Gabriel I Cardinal Tappuni, Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, on the occasion of his silver episcopal Jubilee, celebrated a pontifical Liturgy in his titular church of the Twelve Apostles in Rome. The next day he left for Paris, where he was received with the honours due to a Prince of the Church and worked for the interests of the Christians of the East.

On November 28th, His Eminence celebrated a solemn Liturgy in the church of the Invalides, and in the evening of the same day received the decoration of the Legion of Honour with the title of Commander. On December 8th, 1937, His Eminence returned to Beirut, where he was received with princely honours. At Antioch the celebrations were kept on February 6th, 1938.

THE CATHOLIC CHALDEANS.

At the beginning of October, 1937, His Blessedness Mar Joseph Emmanuel II Thomas, Katholikos-Patriarch of Babylon, left Mossul for Aleppo and Beirut. In the latter city he raised to the dignity of Chorepiscopus Mgr. Joseph T'finkdji, his Patriarchal Vicar for the Lebanon, and then embarked for Rome and Paris.

Soon afterwards occurred, in a hospital in Beirut, the death of Mgr. Philip Shauriz, Chorepiscopus and Patriarchal Vicar in Upper Gezireh. R.I.P.

MALABAR.

On November 29th, 1937, Mar Severius, the Jacobite Metropolitan of Niranam, was reconciled to the Church. He took his degree of B.A. at the University of Calcutta, he had been a disciple of Mar Ivanios and was consecrated bishop in 1933.

The following summary of the position of Christians in Malabar will help the reader to see the position of the new Catholic bishop.

Ten years ago the position in South-West India was this. There were over 600,000 Catholics of the Malabar-Chaldean rite, and over 450,000 of the Latin rite (fruit of European missionary efforts among the heathen since the fifteenth century); there were some 360,000 Jacobite schismatics, of the Antiochene rite; and about 240,000 other Indian Christians, Protestants or semi-protestantized. These Christians are often referred to in bulk as St. Thomas Christians, because of their tradition that they were evangelized by that apostle; but the name is particularly arrogated to itself by the chief of the "reformed" bodies.

Since the beginning of this century there have been two parties among the Malabar Jacobites: those who want their Church to be a province under the supreme jurisdiction of the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, and those who want it to be independent under its own head, called the *Katholikos*. The quarrel has been very bitter, involving law-suits about property and recognition, and has had a grievous effect on the religious life of this dissident church. In 1925 the bishops of the "independent" party considered the possibility of reunion with Rome, and the result of this was the reconciliation of two of them, Mar Ivanios (Givergis Paniker-veettil) and Mar Theophilos (Kalapurakal), with the Catholic Church.

These two were followed by several lower clergy and a thousand lay people, and their number grew so quickly that the Holy See in 1932 organized them into the archdiocese of Trivandrum and the diocese of Tiruvella, with Mar Ivanios and Mar Theophilos as Metropolitan and bishop respectively. So there is now a third Catholic body in Malabar, distinguished as the "Malankara rite" and using the Antiochene Liturgy (as do the Catholic "Pure" Syrians of Syria and Irak). That body to-day numbers more than 36,000 faithful. The reconciliation of the young and distinguished Jacobite bishop of Niranam, Nar Severios, who like many other Indian Jacobites has profited from the work of "High-Church" Anglican missionaries in his country, is a further strengthening of the Malankara Catholics. Like the other two bishops, he came from the "independent" party among the Jacobites.

ESTONIA.

The following are some interesting impressions regarding work in Estonia from Father J. H. Ryder, S.J. :

"It is scarcely possible to speak of our prospects of work in detail as yet. One thing is certain, that whatever works our brother religious do or have done in other civilised countries will find their place here too, according to circumstances. Fr. Bourgeois' sermons, lectures, conversations and services up and down have been much appreciated. It is said that to succeed we must go out and seek ; the Estonians will not come to us to seek the truth, because both Orthodox and Lutheran are so persuaded that Catholicism is the very deuce that, like many of our non-Catholic brethren in Great Britain, they will not come near it at any price. It is included in the evil influences which a seminarist may take a vow to avoid until he has finished his theology. In this connection it is important to bear in mind that Esna lies in a *Lutheran* region. This is an advantage in that there will not be any of that unpleasant friction which experience has shown may produce much heat where Orthodox and Catholic Easterners have parishes side by side. The disadvantage that goes with it, that of being out of immediate personal touch, will almost disappear when we have a car, for from the centre, where we are, to the Southern and North-Eastern provinces, strongholds of Orthodoxy, is not out of range. There are many Old Believers on the banks of Lake Peipsi.

"As a matter of fact, our Lutheran neighbours are not to be ruled out as no concern of ours. They come to the Liturgy, more especially in the summer, and it is not unlikely they will find the Faith in numbers enough to warrant a parish being formed. In some such way we might find children enough for a school, and hence candidates for the priesthood. The Government would like nothing better. They want the Catholic clergy to be Estonian as far and as soon as possible, very naturally. Two young men started their studies at the Russicum last September ; other two are preparing for the priesthood in the Latin rite. Two were to have come to Esna for lessons this Winter, but they seem to have lost heart, for the moment at least.

"Relations between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic clergy suffered a considerable strain during the summer after an unfortunate word, seeming to cast contempt on the Orthodox priesthood, slipped off the translator's pen in an article in one of the two Catholic magazines produced in the country. That will blow over, of course. One often finds, I hear, that some who show willingness to enter into

friendship with Catholics, and even to work for reunion, do so out of, if one can say it without offence, a mistaken notion of the Church. By reunion they hope to strengthen their own national Church as such, by sharing in the vast resources of learning and charitable works of the Church of Rome. They will share in these blessings, of course, and will be welcome to them, if ever they become Catholics ; indeed they, like many others, may share in them before, but the enjoyment of these benefits can never be of itself a sufficient reason for conversion. Their saving motive must always be the desire to be where revealed truth lies. The sooner we all realise that, the better, to avoid disillusionment.

“The Lutheran Church is on much more intimate terms with the Official Religion than we, in spite of a storm that blew up a year or so ago. Their zealous Pastors have, in many Orthodox parishes, leave to preach and do all they can to counter the atheist theories that are always in the air around the U.S.S.R. Naturally, this work brings with it Lutheran doctrine itself. Actually every year thousands of Orthodox embrace the Confession of Augsburg. I am not sure yet how fast a hold Orthodoxy has on the Estonians. (I mean to state here simply my lack of knowledge, not to insinuate anything.) Before the Reformation, of course, the country was Catholic of the Latin rite ; Pravoslavia was introduced by Russia in relatively recent times. Certainly, now-a-days the people and the Government look to the West for everything political and cultural, especially, as you know, to the Anglo-Saxon peoples. They do not preserve the Byzantine rite with the same precision as their fellow Russian Orthodox, but are rather wont to change it to fit in with modern ways of thinking. I hope they will go easy ! It is the opinion of an Estonian observer that unless the Church can put in her oar very quickly, Estonian Orthodoxy will go over to Lutheranism.

NARVA.

“This visit was, frankly, by way of a holiday. I wanted to see Fr. Methodius in his parish, the old town with its grand castles, one on either side of the narrow swift Narvona, from which German or Swedish lords and Russians defied each other for centuries, and the Russian frontier. Fr. Methodius, a Dutch Capuchin as you know, has about fifty parishioners when they all live up to their duties. His church is rather of the nature, architecturally, of a chapel built into the house that serves as presbytery. He himself has decorated it in traditional Russian style both with the brush and wood-chisel. He finds it difficult to get a choir

together, but the singing I heard was distinctly good. However, it will be long before he, who is an artist in this line too, will be satisfied. The Orthodox spirit in the town is said not to be any longer so characteristically Russian as formerly. There is much opposition to Catholic endeavours there.

PETSERIMAA.

"This, then, was a few weeks before the call came for Petseri, the chief town of Petserimaa, the South-Eastern corner of Estonia, famous for its monastery under the Russian name of Pechery for hundreds of years. I stayed with Fr. Lucian, O.Min.Cap., of the Latin rite, who keeps the flag flying there singlehanded. In this, the most beautiful region of Estonia, in brilliant July weather for three weeks I tramped, and occasionally 'bussed through the picturesque valleys with their many streams and the woods of varied culture, unlike those in our home region, which are generally of fir, and over the cultivated higher ground, which however rarely reaches the rank of hill, visiting the Batiooshki in every parish I passed through, and taking many opportunities to gossip with the people. The Petseri region is Russian ethnographically, so that there was no question of my being hampered in this form of apostolate by my still poor knowledge of Estonian. Here one finds, indeed, a bit of Old Russia, with some imperfections removed.

"The conversations increased my understanding of Orthodoxy considerably; in most cases we got down to brass tacks quickly.

"Their notions about infallibility in many cases were confused. The Russian word they use for it, 'niepogreshimosts,' means literally "impeccability" and they think we use it in this sense—some of them, that is to say. I told them I thought that terminology must have been invented in some dark hour by Old Nick, and explained what we do mean. In this connection I have to record one or two slight wins as far as theology goes: one priest saw clearly that a man may be infallible and yet sin. He backed his view, quite rightly, with our Lord's words about the Pharisees—do what they teach, not as they do. One very respected and influential cleric assured me there was no possibility of reunion so long as the Roman Catholic clergy and people remained so proud. Elsewhere we have touched on the Russian conception of God's doing in everything to the complete exclusion of man's; I find it is because we believe we too are doers (we co-operate with God for salvation, we baptise, absolve, etc.), that we are thought proud. I said (as I thought) I could understand our active self(?)-confident clergy of

the West giving the impression of pride to men who took this view of man's nothingness, but tried to hint we had theological grounds for the use of the first person in the administration of the Sacraments, and for behaving for the rest like sons of God. Yet much more needs to be said to reconcile this teaching of ours in Russian monastic minds with that throwing away of self and putting on Christ which is, I was assured, the central spiritual act upon entering the religious life in the East. Of course, one points out, it is not less important than the vows for us too (if one can, indeed, distinguish them, in daily life, from self-abnegation).

"I visited the monastery in Petseri several times, and found things to praise and things that seemed not to deserve it. There are about twenty-five monks in apartments that formerly held about one hundred. Their rule is that of the immemorial Studite Monastery of Constantinople, founded by St. Theodore. The monastery has good revenues and the buildings are handsome and well grouped against a small eminence. In this hill there are miles of catacombs containing the remains of thousands of Christians. The rock is a soft goldish sandstone that lends itself to gallery-making equally well with the tufa of Rome. There are good and, I imagine, precious eikons in the Church (which is dedicated to the Assumption), but the building material seems to have been universally of common quality.

"While I was in Petseri, by a happy coincidence a party of English people with their Chaplain, the Rev. H. R. Wilson of York, spent a week or more there with Russian friends of the Society of SS. Alban and Serge (a Society very active in England in bringing Anglicans and Orthodox together. Their magazine "Sobornost" contains much useful information about Soviet Russia as well.) The visit was partly by way of pilgrimage, partly by way of holiday. It was a great pleasure to meet and discuss with members of the party and their Russian friends."

SHANGHAI.

Round Shanghai there are nearly 50,000 Russian emigrants and the largest Catholic Russian parish in the world.

In January a school for Russian girls was opened by the Irish Columban Sisters, which promises to be a great success. There are seven sisters and at present 39 pupils, though they expect 80 by September.

It is in Shanghai that Father F. Wilcock, S.J., is going, to form a school for Russian boys run on the same lines as that at Namur where the boys, living in the school, are brought up with a real knowledge of Russian and the traditions of

their country both as regards the Liturgy and secular culture and at the same time attend the ordinary classes at the neighbouring Catholic colleges.

If this school follows in the same tradition as that of St. George's, Namur, it will do much to pave the way for reunion among the Catholics and Orthodox in the Far East.

U.S.A.

The expression "Syrian Catholic" is made to do duty in the United States for three different bodies of people who, though racially more or less the same, at any rate in origin, and all speaking Arabic, belong each to a different ecclesiastical rite: they are the (Pure) Syrians, the (Byzantine) Melkites, and the Syro-Maronites. Two Syrian Catholic hierarchs have recently been in America visiting the faithful of their respective rites, namely, Mar Cyril George Dallal, Syrian Archbishop of Mosul in Irak, and Mgr. Paul Salman, Melkite Archbishop of Amman in Transjordanian.

According to official figures there are 7,500 Pure Syrians in North America (mostly around Boston, Hartford, New York, Columbus and Detroit), who have no permanent clergy of their rite at all. There are another 5,000 in South America, with three priests. There are 13,500 Melkites, with a dozen or more priests, chiefly in New England, New York State, Detroit and Ohio State: their church on Washington Street in New York City is a shocking example of almost complete latinization, but they have a good Byzantine building in Brooklyn.

There are now two Russian Catholic priests of Byzantine rite working in the United States, one in the west and one in the east. Father Michael Nedtotshin was invited to establish himself in his diocese by the Archbishop of Los Angeles, where there is a small Russian Catholic group. The Chapel of St. Andrew has been opened on South Cummings Street.

From New York Father Andrew Rogosh is commissioned to make a survey of the Russian religious situation in the eastern and middle-western states. Cardinal Hayes has put at his disposal a room in a building next door to Old St. Patrick's church on Mulberry Street, and this is now being fitted up as the chapel of St. Michael, much of the work on it being done by Father Rogosh himself. His congregation of a score or so is scattered all over the vast city of New York, but a number of Latins also find their way to St. Michael's and several enthusiasts are learning the Slavonic text and music in order to sing at the Sunday Liturgy.

A Catholic Byzantine body in the United States of whom relatively little is heard is the Rumanians. There are some 8,000 of them, with their chief centres around Cleveland, Trenton, N.J., and Rockford, Ill. In the first-named city they have two churches and two chapels, all in charge of Father George Babutiu; the principal church, though small, showing a freedom from hybridization characteristic of the Rumanians. It is surprising to find in so small a city as Aurora in Illinois a large thoroughly oriental Catholic Rumanian Church, complete with its own parochial school.

POLAND.

For some years past, the Polish State has sought the destruction of the Byzantine Churches of the Ukrainians in Poland. Orthodox churches have been demolished, burnt down, changed into Latin, or secularised, on the plea that at one time they were Catholic, but that they were confiscated for the Orthodox under the Czarist régime.

This policy received apparent sanction on July 8th, when the Vatican ratified an agreement with the Polish Government whereby the latter relinquished all claim to Orthodox Church properties in Chelm and Pidliashe, that were formerly Ukrainian Catholic. The agreement has been severely criticised by the Ukrainian Catholics, who regard it as forced upon the Holy See by political expediency, but they justly point out that a great number of the churches seized were built either before the Union of 1596 or after its abolition in 1875, and were therefore either not originally, or at no time Catholic, either Latin or Byzantine. Furthermore, that the Ukrainian Catholic Metropolitan has been entirely ignored in the 'revindication' of allegedly former Ukrainian Catholic churches many of which have been converted to Latin Catholic use.

The work has been conducted by local Polish officials, with extreme cynicism, and utter disregard of civil and religious rights of Ukrainians. Congregations have been left churchless, Orthodox laity imprisoned for passive resistance to the re-consecration of their church precincts by Polish priests, Orthodox clergy have been sent to gaol for celebrating the Liturgy, and—on a Polish estimate—some 400,000 Orthodox have been "converted" to Latin Catholicism. There is ample evidence of the methods of these "conversions" which include intimidation by the K.O.P. (Polish Border Defence Corps) and economic pressure by the civil authorities.

Not only the Orthodox, but, more recently, the Ukrainian Catholics, have been coerced into the Latin Church, in flagrant defiance of the Concordat between Rome and Poland of 1925, which prohibits change from Byzantine Catholic

to Latin Rite, without special permission from the Holy See. From one parish alone, 366 Ukrainian Catholics registered with the civil authorities, a change of rite, and it is estimated that some 200,000 Catholic Ukrainians have so left their ancestral Church, under promise of work, which is otherwise refused, of permits to buy land commonly reserved to Poles, and other economic and social advantages.

Perhaps the most tragic aspect of this religious coercion is its effect upon the prospects of union between the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholics. In accordance with the express instructions of the Papacy, the Catholic authorities had attempted the formation of a Slav-Byzantine Rite, as a demarcation from the "Ruthenian," intended for the reunited Orthodox Ukrainians. In this they had been encouraged by the Orthodox themselves, who had shown themselves distinctly favourable to a return to the Church which they only left through the coercion of the Czars. Deputations of Orthodox clergy had been received by the Ukrainian Catholic Hierarchy, seeking unity, and the Catholic Ukrainians believed that the "corporate reunion" of some three and a half million Orthodox with an equal number of the Catholics would have been effected, but for the ban of the Polish Government on Ukrainian Catholic-Orthodox intercourse. The result of this Polish obstruction, and of the agreement between the Holy See and Poland (the text of which is not yet public) has been the ruination of these plans for reunion, and the identification of the Pope, in the Orthodox mind, with the oppressing State. It is, however, only fair to stress that large numbers of the churches seized do not appear to come under the agreement, that the Holy See is not responsible for the cruel, and illegal, methods of their seizure by the Polish Government, that, on the contrary, the Papacy has repeatedly emphasised the necessity for the utmost charity in dealing with the Eastern dissidents, and disapproved most emphatically of their latinisation.

We add some extracts from the memorandum of the Orthodox Metropolitan Dionysy which states the position clearly.

"MEMORANDUM concerning the situation of the Orthodox Church in the voivodship of Lublin, addressed to the representatives of the Government, and the legislative assembly of the Republic of Poland :

"The Orthodox Church in the reborn Polish Republic, has not had its relation to the State defined and regularised, up to the present day.

"The ante-Sobor Council convened on the instructions of H.E. the President of the Polish Republic has been unsuccessful in its efforts. In the course of the last few years,

the meetings of the committees set up to work out the legal conditions of the relations of the Orthodox Church to the Polish State, have been obstructed.

"We know that there has already been made public the regulations concerning the relations to the State of all religious bodies, with the exception of the largest body of the largest minority—the Orthodox. This is very humiliating for the Orthodox, who have been given no reason for having been worse treated than the citizens of other religious denominations. The Orthodox people of some five millions are very much perturbed and agitated because of this. The situation gives rise to incidents which are now disturbing our religious life. Lack of legal status leads to irregular treatment of the needs of the Orthodox Church by the local administrative officials, which in many cases has led to gross infringements of rights. This is especially the case of recent times in the Lublin voivodship, where the Orthodox population is painfully wounded by hostile treatment which disregards their most elementary religious needs.

"Against the regulations of articles 110/111/113 of the Constitution and article 16 of the provisional laws, in which the State and Government guarantee freedom of worship and religious practice for members of the Orthodox Church, the administrative authorities coerce the Orthodox clergy by threat and fine.

"They are compelled to abandon the liturgical Church Slavonic language and to celebrate Mass and the services, to preach the sermons, in the Polish language. Priests who refuse submission, due to the demands of their people (who never agreed to the elimination of the liturgical language which they have used for centuries), are deprived of their stipends by the State, witness cases in the districts of Tomaszow, Bilgoraj, Hrubieszow, Chelm (Kholm) and others.

"They are forced to cease their ministrations, and to leave their parishes (54 such cases). The clergy and the faithful are induced to desert their Faith (district Bilgoraj, Hrubieszow, and others). The authority of the head of the autocephalous Orthodox Church in Poland is undermined by slights and disrespectful treatment in the presence of the clergy and faithful (Biala-Podlaska, Tomaszow). Priests who have been unable to obtain Polish citizenship although they have tried for years, are threatened with deportation to the Soviet border. Others are deprived, without cause, of their stipends (district Bilgoraj, Tomaszow, Hrubieszow, Chelm). Clergy not in receipt of Government stipends have been fined from 200 to 1,200 zlots., and imprisoned for periods up to eight months, for celebrating the Liturgy, and other services.

They are instructed to report each day, or every few days, to the district governor (who sometimes lives miles away).

"A great number of churches have been closed down and sealed, and private oratories, also many have been demolished. Priests have been deprived of personal liberty and expelled from their parishes, and many have been arrested.

"... Summarising the above, we note with pain that the present conditions created by the administrative authorities disturb the peaceful cohabitation between the Orthodox and Catholic peoples that existed until recently, proof of which existed in the frequent appeals by the Roman Catholic population to the Government to reopen churches for the Orthodox. To-day hatred reigns supreme in the Lublin voivodship; one brother arises against another. Those who defend their right to pray in their own houses of worship are thrown into prison, and severely beaten, as in Moratyn of the district of Tomaszow, and Chmielek in Bilgoraj.

"... The continuous procrastination in normalising the position of the Orthodox Church according to Canon and Civil Law, as well as according to the Constitution, strikes at the interests and prestige of the State. In the present uncertain times when all the citizens of the Polish State regardless of racial descent, nationality, and religion, should stand united in defence of the integrity and independence of the State, it is inadvisable to foment a religious war based upon differences of rite. To force the God-fearing Orthodox population into the ways of Communism and godlessness by the closure of their churches and oratories and by depriving them of any chance of hearing services, will not bring any gain to the State. On the contrary it will bring huge losses and harm—witness the spread of Communist leaflets in the district of Hrubieszow.

"The Orthodox people, devoted to their Holy Faith are also loyal to the Polish State—witness the blood of their sons who died in defence of the State boundaries and who merited the praise of the great Marshal of Poland Josef Pilsudski—to-day prove their loyalty at every step by performing all the duties imposed by the State, such as payment of taxes, etc.

"In view of the foregoing, we strongly ask and recommend that all the administrative edicts inimical to the interests of the Orthodox Church should be immediately withdrawn, the fines and penalties against the Orthodox clergy cancelled, the Orthodox clergy and laity treated on an equal footing with citizens of other rites, that the administrative organs should cease their proselytism and leave it to the Roman Catholic Church, and that the Government in collaboration

with the Orthodox authorities should normalise in a parliamentary manner the relation of the Church to the State.

“We demand that our churches and oratories which were converted or sealed should be returned; that we should not be humiliated because we belong to the Orthodox Faith and because we speak the Ukrainian language which we inherited from our forefathers and use in our church sermons, and the Church Slavonic which we use in our Liturgy, that Orthodox children should not be compelled to receive Roman Catholic religious training, and that in general we, as loyal citizens of the Polish State, should be guaranteed defence and protection of the law.”

And we subjoin to this the *Pastoral Letter* of the Catholic Ukrainian Metropolitan, Mgr. Andrew Sheptytsky.

“ANDREW, Metropolitan of Lwiw and Halych:

“To the Right Reverend Bishops, the Most Reverend Members of the Chapters, and to the Clergy of the Province of Halych. The Peace of the Lord and His Blessings be upon you!

“The shocking events of the last months in Kholm compel me to arise publicly in defence of our persecuted brethren of the un-united Orthodox Church, of Volynia, Chelm, Pidliashe, and Polissia, and to call upon you to pray and do penance that heaven may bestow God’s mercy.

“Approximately one hundred churches have been taken apart and demolished. Many have been closed. Some have been burnt by the hands of unknown malefactors. In the closed churches and chapels services have been forbidden, either inside or outside. Among the churches ruined there were many ancient monuments of ecclesiastical architecture. Very often even the sacred ornaments have been destroyed. At times people have been forced, by violence, to accept the Catholic Faith, in the Latin Rite. Priests, supported by the meagre contributions of the poor, who, under orders from their spiritual superiors, were performing their pastoral duties, have been exiled, and painfully penalised, either by monetary fines or imprisonment. Innocent people have been beaten and expelled from their homes. It is not even permitted to teach the Catechism, or to preach in the mother-tongue of the population.

“The Orthodox Church is veiled in sorrow, Orthodox Churches outside the boundaries of the State have ordained prayers and fasting to invoke from heaven a cessation of religious persecution. The whole Orthodox population of Poland is perturbed. The people of Chelm have been wounded in their most sacred and noble feelings, and all the Eastern

Churches united with Rome are grieving at the blow delivered at the very idea of unification.

"All this happened at a time when the Government was submitting for ratification to the Sejm the agreement concerning the after-Union properties, between the Apostolic See and the Polish State. By virtue of the synchronization of the events, the initiators and organisers of the acts of destruction have cast the odium of what has transpired on the Apostolic See. The events in Kholm have destroyed in the souls of the Orthodox—our un-united brethren—the very thought of a possible union, and represent the Catholic Church as inimical and dangerous to the Orthodox people. In the eyes of several millions of inhabitants of Poland, the Apostolic See is regarded as partly responsible for the acts of destruction. A new abyss is being opened up between the Orthodox and the Catholic Churches.

"Who is responsible for this material and moral ruin? Who dared, in a Catholic State, before the eyes of a representative of the Apostolic See—the Papal Nuncio—before the eyes of numerous Catholic bishops—to deliver such a horrible blow to the Catholic Church? Who dared, contrary to the interests of the State, to trample on the tradition of Marshal Pilsudski, and carry out such an unprecedented act?

"This could have been inspired only by hidden enemies of the Catholic Church and of Christianity. They alone could benefit. They had an easy task as, in destroying part of the Catholic Church, they could pretend that they were destroying enemies of the State. They were doing this with the silent approval and joyous applause of many Catholics. We did not turn to our brethren of the Latin Rite for aid; they might have refused it—since they consider us disloyal citizens—regardless of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Enemies of Christianity in Poland cannot come out openly against the Catholics, for they are far too powerful. They must mask their blows, acting through others, indirectly, but even then they can be recognised by the goals at which they aim.

"Having become more daring by virtue of success, they have ventured at last to deliver a blow at poor innocent peasants and priests of Kholm, whom no-one could accuse of disloyalty to the State. They make use of patriotic slogans such as 'The leavening-out of historical injustices' and 'The destruction of traces of servitude,' prompting un-informed Catholics to un-Christian deeds. They dealt this blow at the innocent Orthodox so skilfully that they simultaneously struck the Catholic Church, and thereby revealed themselves for what they are in reality—enemies of that Church, and of Christianity.

"We must painfully feel the sufferings of our brethren and must brand these anti-Christian acts. The destruction of churches in places where they are necessary for the people, the prohibition of church services, and the punishments for prayers, must be regarded by us as evidence of religious persecution.

"Unfortunately we must regard as a triumph for the enemies of the Church—the Masons—this mortal blow at the very idea of the union of the Churches and at the authority of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See.

"We must protest against the effort to cast grim shadows of suspicion that the Apostolic See approves of the war with the Orthodox Church. We must also protest against the attempt to justify the events in Kholm, and the political struggle with the Ukrainian nation, by the claim that this is in the interests of the Catholic Church.

"Perhaps to-day Catholic opinion is not yet properly orientated; many Catholics do not yet realise what has happened. But that which has happened is, and shall remain, a grim memento for Catholic Poland.

"It is an encouragement to those who are being persecuted as well as to us, that the just God in Heaven is witnessing our sufferings. The fate of nations is in God's hands. Out of the sufferings of the poor, God may produce a true and enduring good—glory and victory for the Holy Catholic Church.

"Given in Pidliute on the day of the ever-memorable prophet Saint Elias, July 20th, in the year of our Lord 1938.

ANDREW
Metropolitan."

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL.

It is reported in *Sobornost* (June, 1938), that the synod of the Church of Alexandria has considered the problem of the convocation of an Œcumenical Council; and that the Church of Greece had decided, last year, to ask the Patriarch of Constantinople to reassemble the Pre-Council Œcumenical Conference at Athos. It is to be hoped that some way will be found by which such a council can be called in spite of the difficulty of the Russian Church in taking part, and this difficulty should not be insuperable.

THE ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM

The following is reported in *The Church Times* (July 29th, 1938) :

"The Palestine Government, on July 21st, published a draft ordinance to revise and amend the law relating to the organization and administration of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem. This is the long awaited ordinance recommended in 1926 by a special commission consisting of Sir Anton Bertram, former Chief Justice of Ceylon, and Mr. J. W. A. Young, sometime Financial Adviser to the Orthodox Patriarchate, as a means for settling the sixty-year-old struggle of the Arabic-speaking laity for a larger share in the affairs of the Patriarchate. The ordinance, as finally drafted on the basis of long conferences between the Patriarchate and the laity, is a compromise measure, not quite identical with the Bertram-Young proposals but substantially the same, and more liberal towards the laity than the Turkish order of 1910. The draft ordinance, if signed, will replace the Ottoman Imperial Regulations of 1875, known as the Fundamental Law, with a modern, more clear and appropriate constitution. Being a compromise measure, it cannot be entirely satisfactory either to the Patriarchate or to the laity, but it provides a basis upon which the work of the Church, all too long interrupted by internal disputes, may again go forward with a greater hope of co-operation and unity than for many years.

"The *status quo* and ecclesiastical tradition are fully recognized in maintaining the position of the Patriarch and the Patriarch in Synod. Furthermore, the manner of electing the Patriarch who is also the head of the Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre, and the manner of selecting the married priests representing the lay people are carefully defined. An important concession has been made to local feeling in providing that the Patriarch, as indeed all members of the Fraternity, be Palestinian citizens.

"The most significant change in the present state of affairs is the constitution of a Mixed Council, known as the Patriarch in Council, and consisting of the Patriarch, seven ecclesiastical members selected by the Patriarch in Synod, and ten lay members chosen by local Councils, including three from Transjordan. This Mixed Council has been granted in principle by previous Patriarchs but has never succeeded in functioning. The Mixed Council will be given one third of the general revenues of the Patriarchate (estimated to amount to about L.P. 10,000 as the laity's share), to be spent on maintaining schools for the laity, seminaries for the clergy, and support for the parish priests. The Council will be a

legal personality, able to hold movable and immovable property, and to act as trustee for benefactions. While the Council is to have control only over its own share of the general revenue, it will have the right to see the general budget of the Patriarch in Synod.

“Under the Mixed Council there will be Local Councils in six main centres, which are to perform analogous functions for the groups of parishes which they represent. The Jerusalem Local Council is to be given a sum not to exceed L.P. 2,200 a year for the assistance of the poor and those who have free rent given them.

“In addition to the Ecclesiastical Court now in Jerusalem, which will become a spiritual Court of Appeal, provision is made for three spiritual Courts of First Instance, consisting of clerical members in the towns of Jerusalem, Jaffa and Haifa, to administer certain portions of the Family Law of Karavokyros, with an Appeal Court in Jerusalem; and three Mixed Courts of First Instance, with some lay members, in the same towns to deal with other portions of the Family Law, having its own Court of Appeal in Jerusalem. All Orthodox ecclesiastical courts will be under the general supervision of the High Court of Palestine, and will be subject to inspection by Orthodox inspectors appointed by the Chief Justice of Palestine.

“The financial affairs of the Patriarchate are also to be subject to audit by auditors appointed by the Patriarch in Synod, and those of the Mixed Council by the Patriarch in Council, with the concurrence of the High Commissioner. And any dispute concerning the share to be given the Mixed Council is subject to adjudication by an arbiter appointed by the High Commissioner.

“The rules for the election of a Metropolitan or Bishop provide for appointment by the Patriarch in Synod, subject to confirmation by the High Commissioner. But a candidate must be a Palestinian citizen and have a knowledge of Arabic as well as the other ecclesiastical qualifications. And a Pastoral Bishop, of whom there may not be more than three (the customary number), shall have from the people of his future diocese a formal document signifying their concurrence before he be appointed.

“The rules for holding elections to the Local and Mixed Councils are most elaborate, and provide for every male Orthodox over the age of twenty-one to have a vote. The Government is to supervise the elections.

“The reforms contemplated in the above document were first given formal shape when Bertram and Young made their report in 1926, but were pigeon-holed during the life-time

of the late Patriarch Damianos. The disputes which arose over the question whether the reform should precede the election of a new Patriarch or follow thereupon, caused a delay from 1931 to 1935 before the election was held and Mgr. Timotheos chosen. Now another three years have elapsed during which the confirmation of the Patriarch-elect has been withheld pending a settlement. It is to be hoped that this ordinance, or some acceptable modification, will shortly be enacted, so that the confirmation of the Patriarch-elect may be given and the affairs of the ancient Mother Church of Jerusalem again be put on a firm foundation.

"The interference of Government in the internal affairs of the Church, however many precedents there may be in Turkish times, is not to be approved, but having understood it to be its duty to intervene for the sake of the common good, Government should at least try to be expeditious and not by inordinate delay destroy the very body it has undertaken to help."

THE CHURCH IN JUGOSLAVIA.

The Metropolitan Gabriel of Cetinje (Montenegro) was enthroned as Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church on February 22nd, 1938. The office has been vacant since the death of Patriarch Varnavas in July, 1937.

The new Patriarch was born in 1881. He received his theological education at the Theological School at Halki, at Athens and in Switzerland. In 1911 he was appointed bishop of Prisren, and after the restoration of the Serbian Patriarchate he was translated to the metropolitan see of Montenegro. He is known as a great Yugoslavian patriot. (*Sobornost* ibidem).

In September a conference of Orthodox youth took place in Yugoslavia. The Metropolitan Dositeios was chairman of the Committee. (*Ibidem*).

INTERDENOMINATIONAL.

The Conference of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius at High Leigh, July 4th to 7th, 1938.

Previous to the conference a letter was issued setting out the purpose of this year's study subject; it was the need and difficulties of Christian Unity. "One of the most difficult, yet decisive aspects of the Reunion problem is the reconciliation between the Eastern and Western traditions in Christianity, and it is becoming more and more evident that the success of Church Reunion depends to a large extent on the satisfactory solution of this problem. Any progress in this

direction is impossible without a much larger number of people who are at once well-informed on the questions involved and spiritually committed to the search for a solution. Here the Fellowship has special opportunities and responsibilities." This is how the letter states the subject, and it goes on to say: "The forthcoming Fellowship Conference will be devoted to the study of the present relations between the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches in this general œcumenical context. Its main task will be to seek light on the next steps in bringing these two communions closer together. It is hoped that the Conference will give a new impetus to our study-work, both as individuals and in groups. We greatly need to give more time to the systematic study of the questions that will be raised, and the Conference can only be a new beginning."

These two quotations we feel do not only describe the purpose of the last Conference, but the general aim of the Fellowship, and hence it is that we would call upon Catholics to take note.

The Orthodox representatives at High Leigh this July included, besides Russians, Rumanians, Bulgarians and Yugoslavs. Among the clergy were the Metropolitan Eulogius, the Archpriest Sergius Bulgakov, the Archimandrite Cassian, Dr. Vintilescu (Rumanian), the Archimandrite Nathanael (from Harbin), and the Hegumen Athanasius (who had been in Palestine and Alexandria). Among the Anglican clergy were Bishop Palmer, Canon Hodgson, the Rev. A. M. Ramsey and Dr. T. M. Parker. Dr. Rosendal of the Swedish Lutheran Church was also present.

In the full Conference several papers were read both by Orthodox and Anglicans on the problem of Christian Unity. There were also discussion groups that considered questions of *Doctrine, Liturgy and Worship*, and *The Order of the Church*.

Dr. Zernov, the Secretary, read a report of the work of the Fellowship from which one gathered that a real interest was being roused in many Anglican dioceses through organised talks and, in some cases, study groups. By this method the laity were being schooled with a view to reunion work. On the part of the clergy there was a system of exchange between Anglican and Orthodox church students which was by no means only confined to an exchange with Russians. Rumanians had some theological students in England, and many Anglican students were studying in Rumanian seminaries. There were also students from Yugoslavia and Estonia.

Besides all this, the important part that the Fellowship gives to common worship should be remembered, both groups taking part in one another's public worship, although they

do not receive Holy Communion together. This certainly helps to create an atmosphere of friendliness when discussing the points at issue, yet it by no means prevents the Orthodox from very openly asserting their claim to be the true Church.

When one remembers that this was the sixth annual conference, Catholics will have some idea of the progress of the movement of Anglo-Orthodox relations. Englishmen are getting to know and love much of Catholic faith, practice and worship through the way of Orthodoxy, together with, of course, an outlook that is proper to the Eastern Christian Tradition. Orthodoxy, on the other hand, is made alive to the real state of things in the Anglican Church even if, on the whole, they are brought in touch for the most part only with the different groups of Anglo-Catholics. This interplay of Anglican and Orthodox relationship is by no means of its nature antagonistic to Catholicism.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

Subscriptions for the 1939 EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY are now due. Please send the same to the London Agent.

The Greek Choir now meets regularly every week for practice at 150 Hamilton Terrace, London, N.W.8, in view of rendering the music at the Byzantine-Greek Liturgy which it is hoped will be organized by the Society of St. John Chrysostom early in 1939. Anyone who wishes to join this choir is asked to communicate with Miss Barbara Fry at the above address.

THE INCARNATION AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

This comment on the *Doctrine in the Church of England* of Father Sergius Bulgakov, published in *Sobornost* (June, 1938), is of great interest:—

“In the Report of the Doctrinal Commission it is asserted ‘that the Virgin Birth possesses its traditional importance for Christians’ and that ‘belief in the Word made flesh is integrally bound up with belief in the Virgin Birth and that this will be increasingly recognised.’ There is however along with this another opinion ‘that a full belief in the historical Incarnation . . . took place under the normal conditions of human generation.’¹ In the judgment of the Commission both views are compatible with the acceptance ‘of the reality of our Lord’s Incarnation, which is the central

¹The omitted words are “is more consistent with the supposition that our Lord’s birth”—Editor.

truth of the Christian faith.' (p. 83). The Orthodox Church, like the Roman Catholic, entirely denies this compatibility, professing in the Nicene Creed the Incarnation from the Holy Ghost and the *Virgin Mary*.'

"The distinctive note of these judgments in the Report consists in the absence of a definite Christology. The Incarnation is considered as a 'historical event,' which can have 'particular modes'; furthermore, an 'alternative formula of Christian faith' turns out to be permissible. In this way the Virgin Birth, and equally a 'normal conception of the seed of Joseph and Mary,' have only the significance of an instrumental detail in the Incarnation. This is of course an entirely different view from that according to which the Incarnation is 'the dispensation of the mystery which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God' (Eph. iii, 9), 'in the fulness of time' (Gal. iv, 4), long preparing in the Old Testament Church, and which is factually manifested in the spiritual genealogy of the Blessed Mother of God. The theory of the birth of Jesus from Joseph and Mary would be called by some 'Nestorianism' (which, according to Professor Goudge, 'in all its forms is fatal to the Gospel; it is not a theory about the Incarnation, but a denial of it'). However, even 'Nestorianism' is in any case a definite Christological doctrine, which has its strong and weak sides. But the simple assertion of the birth of the Word from Joseph and Mary is not only the absence of Christology but a complete denial of it. The sole logical consequence of this would be merely the *Jesuanismus* of the Liberal Protestant school of Harnack and Ritschl, which sees in the God-man only the Rabbi Jesus of Nazareth. Christ, as the New Adam, is not merely *one among many* representatives of humanity, but the *All-man*, restoring in Himself the humanity born of the Old Adam, as free from original sin and offering us redemption. Can a normal human conception" (*i.e.*, conception in the physiological, not the philosophical sense.—Editor) "become the conception of God, or a 'Nestorian Christotokos' be the Theotokos? Furthermore, the conception of Christ is the act of the descent of the Holy Ghost at the Annunciation (which is, of course, likewise made void by rationalism). But can such a descent hallow a sinful human conception? And whence do we gather that this sinful conception (Ps. li, 7), which appears in the world only after the Fall (Gen. iii, 16), is actually normal for a manhood uninjured by sin? On the contrary, is not precisely the Virgin Birth normal for it?

"The Faith must be taken as a whole. In its fulness is implied also belief in the Mother of God as the 'Second Eve.'

To her belongs that fulness of original holy humanity by accepting which the Logos, being perfect God, became also 'perfect' man. She is this humanity of Christ, but as having in herself her own hypostasis. The relationship of Mother and Son is not only a transitional and accidental link set up by the birth of Christ (in which case we could admit of other subsequent births by the agency of Joseph), but it is an abiding link, admitting of neither division nor confusion, similar to the indivisible and inconfusable hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. Hence there is revealed the plenitude of the Church's Mariology, the crown of which is reached in the glorification of the Theotokos. Christ and Mary are depicted together in the eikon of the Theotokos and Child, which is in essence an eikon of the Divine Humanity, of the Divine Incarnation.

"The Incarnation is realised in its fulness not only as the 'coming from heaven' of the Son of God, but also as the sending down into the world of the Holy Ghost for the Incarnation of the Word through His (the Holy Ghost's) overshadowing of the Mother of God, who is revealed as the human temple of the Holy Ghost. But how is it possible, in accepting the Virgin Birth, to limit its force only to the birth of God and to forget her who served in this mystery? Strangely enough people remember the Apostles and honour the followers of Christ, but forget or deny her whom 'all generations call blessed.' In such a maimed Christology the absence of a clearly conceived anthropology is striking. This latter contains the sufficient foundation for the Incarnation in its teaching about the image of God in man, eternally predestined for divinization to become 'god by grace.' The taking of 'perfect' manhood by the Son of God is not the arbitrary and, as it were, violent act of a *deus ex machina*, but it corresponds to the hidden call of human nature, which speaks by the mouth of the Virgin Mary: 'Behold the handmaid of the Lord.' Therefore it is inaccurate to say that in the Incarnation, 'God acted *through* Christ and He still acts *through* Christ' (p. 74). God acts *in* Christ not 'through' human nature but in unconfused and inseparable union with it, according to the dogmas of the Fourth and Sixth Œcumenical Councils, in the one two-natured life of the one hypostasis.

"Those who deny the Virgin Birth do so chiefly from the standpoint of Biblical 'Higher Criticism,' but also from 'biological, psychological and theological objections.' From the standpoint, however, of Biblical criticism there has come as yet no decisive conclusion, in the judgment of responsible investigators,¹ and to reject on these grounds alone the

¹ Cf., e.g., V. Taylor, *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, Oxford, 1928.

direct tradition of the Church, which has for long years glorified the Theotokos, is entirely beside the point and 'uncritical.' As for the various other objections, one must say in reply to this question that here we have not only an instance of reduced faith but also in *error in objecto* or a gnoseological misunderstanding. Can one on such a basis accept the Incarnation, when this latter entirely exceeds the measure of created nature and its laws? Can it be proved altogether rationally? Can it be located within the framework of the causal connection of the phenomena of this world without rending that connection asunder? And why, while confessing the Incarnation, do we hesitate to accept the Virgin Birth, which is in so great a degree a dogmatic postulate of the Faith? Are not those rationalists more logical who with their critical shears trim off a 'scientific-historical' picture of Jesus by excluding from the Gospel everything that is not compatible with their rationalistic world-view (miracles, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and so on)? To accept the fundamental miracle of all—the Incarnation—but to stop half-way by denying from a rationalistic standpoint the Virgin Birth indicates only the inconsistency of a half-faith. One must recognise theological-dogmatic postulates, which have in themselves a different demonstrability and evidentiality from the scientific-rational one derived from 'science,' and one should not measure the truth of the Faith by a yardstick of reason which is not applicable to this problem. It goes without saying that we do not belittle the rights of science and the duty of scientific responsibility; we are only putting things in their right places and critically distinguishing the various aspects of problematics.

"The Incarnation is the joint divine revelation of the Son and the Holy Spirit, sent into the world by the Father: *Logos-Spirit*, and the taking of manhood by God is the meeting and union of God and man: *Jesus-Mary*, and we believe in them with one Faith, that same Faith which includes in itself the whole conjunction of Christian dogmas from the first to the last."

(Translated and slightly abridged).

PROFESSOR WHITTEMORE ON THE MOSAICS OF ST. SOPHIA.

Prof. Whittemore, Director of the Byzantine Institute and Keeper of the Coins and Seals at Harvard University, who is responsible for the uncovering of the mosaics of St. Sophia now being undertaken by the Turkish government, recently gave two lectures on the work at University College, London.

In a series of magnificent slides and colour-films, he dealt with the two tympanum mosaics of the vestibule and narthex here illustrated, with some of the vaulting mosaic and with the greater part of the mosaics uncovered in the imperial gallery, including the imperial portraits. He then showed the Deësis in the imperial gallery, and the great apse mosaics on which he is still at work, and concluded by showing films of the actual methods used in the uncovering and conservation.

One of the most interesting points in both lectures was his emphasis on the extraordinarily dexterous use of light—"a use unknown to Gothic architecture, unknown to Greek architecture." He showed photographs of the rays from the dome lights and other windows, and said that the light fell at the great entrance to the interior when the emperor entered, and followed him as he moved through the building during the liturgy. The mosaics themselves are set strictly relatively to the lighting of each part of the Great Church, so that no two could be inter-changed in position. The component cubes of the mosaics are set tilted downwards so that the light penetrates behind and gives a translucent appearance, the interstices between the lines of cubes being wider or narrower according to the amount of light in the particular position, "so that light is in constant movement." The cubes in high vaults are larger and "put in angularly so as to catch the light and keep the design in constant movement."

In mosaic restoration hitherto the mosaics have been removed and reset, which has involved the loss of the original handling and the treatment of light characteristic of their century. This necessity has been obviated at St. Sophia by inserting at intervals invisible copper pins which re-establish the connection between the brick wall, the setting-beds and the layer of mosaic cubes.

Even to one who has seen the mosaic itself, the photographs and colour-films, in so much detail, of the tympanum mosaic in the entrance vestibule were of very great interest. This mosaic of the Mother of God with the divine Child between Constantine and Justinian is of peculiar majesty. It is illustrated here as a whole.

Of the ninth century is the seated Christ with a kneeling emperor between rondels of the Mother of God and the archangel Gabriel in the central tympanum of the narthex. We give a detailed photograph of the magnificent head of the Saviour.

In the imperial gallery are the "portraits" of emperors and empresses on either side of figures of the Christ or of the Mother of God, and finally fragments of the twelfth century

Deësis—"Supplication of the Mother of God and St. John the Baptist to the Son of God for mankind," in the lecturer's words. Seeing the head of this Christ one is in fact moved to exclaim: "This is indeed the Son of God!" It has been said that these fragments are to Byzantine, what the Parthenon marbles are to Greek art.

None of this work, except the tympana, is visible to the ordinary visitor from the floor of the church, and as yet the apse is enveloped in scaffolding. Here, in a plain gold ground, rises the great figure of the Mother of God which, it is not difficult to see, is, in its present form, a later insertion in the original: exact dates and information await the publication of the official report for the year. Professor Whittemore and his assistants are now at work on the archangel Gabriel, a figure of eighteen feet in height, part of the original work. He holds a staff in his right hand and a crystal orb in his left, and is perhaps the greatest figure yet uncovered.

The uncovering and cleaning of the mosaics is all done by slow, laborious, mechanical means: no chemicals are used but only metal instruments, and brushes of metal, glass or wood. The edges of mosaics are strengthened with plaster, and the brick wall, the mosaic beds and the layer of mosaic itself are rebound with invisible pins, as mentioned above. No old material is taken out and no new put in.

All lovers of art and of the Great Church of Holy Wisdom must be profoundly grateful to the Turkish government and to Professor Whittemore, and interested in the progress of the work. They will also look forward to the further publication of these discoveries. Although the Professor made no allusion to the fact, those who have been to Constantinople lately will have been saddened by the desolate appearance of the church as a whole, and have wished that the cleaning of the marbles, whose colours are almost indistinguishable for grime, could be as carefully undertaken. It doubtless will be in the future.

Professor Norman Baynes, in thanking Professor Whittemore, emphasised the "psychological dominance of Constantinople," in which St. Sophia played such a large part, over the barbarian tribes: they came, were filled with awe and admiration, and went away asking to become Christians and vassals. He spoke of the great importance of "the protection of that great symbolic figure that Professor Whittemore has shown us so often, of our Lady, the Mother of God," and he stressed the great catholicity of the Byzantine Church, which took to itself all that was good in the enthusiasms of the people.

OUR ART CORRESPONDENT.

THE SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

AN EIKON OF ST. VLADIMIR.

The 950th anniversary of the baptism of St. Vladimir, Prince of Kiev and Novgorod, was commemorated in London on the 28th of July last. The Holy Liturgy according to the Byzantine Slavonic rite was celebrated by Father Frederick Wilcock, S.J., at the Church of SS. Anselm and Cecilia, the polyphonic chant being sung by a choir of Catholics under the direction of Mr. P. C. Silby, and a public meeting held at the Breakespeare Club; both of which were arranged by the Society of St. John Chrysostom. Father Dvornik, professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of Prague, gave an address on the important results of his historical researches into the relations between the Holy See and Constantinople in the ninth and tenth centuries, which will be given in full in a future number of *THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*. Mr. Donald Attwater spoke with regret of the exclusively West-European view of the Universal Church which is held by a certain "school of thought" among Catholic writers and publicists in the West, and Count Bennigsen dealt with the historical aspect and referred to some of the recent opinions of historians on the subject of the conversion of St. Vladimir to Christianity. As the latter have been fully dealt with in the July number of *The Month* in an interesting article written by Countess Bennigsen, it will be sufficient to state here that, although there was a certain amount of evangelization from Germany and Scandinavia in the early history of Russia, and St. Olga became a Christian in 957, it was her grandson, St. Vladimir, after his baptism in 988, who was responsible for the beginning of the conversion of Russia to Christianity.

There are some who imagine that the art of eikon-painting has been lost since the Russian Revolution; but the creative tradition still survives among the emigrés, fostered by such Societies as *L'Association L'Icône* of Paris. The eikon of St. Vladimir which is reproduced here, has been painted by a Russian lady in the traditional style after a model of the Stroganov School of the fifteenth-sixteenth century. It was placed on a stand (*Proskynetarion*) at the celebration of the Holy Liturgy in honour of St. Vladimir on the 28th of July last. The Stroganov family were rich commercial magnates in North and East Russia, who employed their wealth in carrying out various services to the State such as the conquest of Siberia and the protection of Kazan during the troublous times. As leaders in civilisation they were great builders and adorners of churches, and kept their own

workshops for eikon-painting. Rovinski tells us that they were the first to recognise eikon-painting as an art and to appreciate the beauty of eikons, also that they seldom repeated the same eikon without making variations and additions.

In order to obtain greater accuracy in drawing the figure of St. Vladimir, a study was made of a drawing of an eikon of St. Vladimir, portrayed with his two sons SS. Boris and Gleb, found in a book of "Essays on the Slavs from the time of Trajan to the invasion of the Tartars", published at St. Petersburg in 1833, and originally copied from a manuscript entitled "The Panegyrics of St. Vladimir," written in 1414, but lost at Moscow in 1816. A study was also made of a work on the faces of Russian Saints as depicted on eikons painted by Likhachev, taken from a manuscript of the fifteenth century.

The date of the canonisation of St. Vladimir was not before 1200 but not later than 1311, when a church dedicated in his honour was built by Archbishop David of Novgorod on top of one of the gates of the Kremlin of Novgorod the Great. The name of St. Vladimir is also connected with another church in Novgorod called the *Desiatinnaya*, now known as the Church of the Dormition of the Mother of God and the *Desiatinnaya*, in which St. Olga was buried. This is referred to in a chapter entitled "The history of the Church of Our Saviour of Nereditsa near Novgorod" in Sychev's "Byzantine Art of the Slavs." It is interesting to note that, for many years after the canonisation of St. Vladimir, Russians venerated eikons of his patron Saint, St. Basil, rather than eikons of St. Vladimir himself.

The following bibliography has been compiled for those interested in the study of eikons of St. Vladimir:

"The old pictures of the Grand Duke Vladimir and the Grand Duchess Olga" by Sreznevsky, published in "Archaeological News," edited by the Moscow Archaeological Society, 1867. "The newly found frescoes at St. Theodore Stratilates at Novgorod," St. Petersburg, 1911. "The old pictures of St. Vladimir" by N. Petrov, published in "The literary works of the Kiev Theological Academy," 1915. "Russian Antiquities" by Prohorov, St. Petersburg, 1871. "The oldest Novgorod eikon of St. Vladimir" by Gousev, St. Petersburg, 1921. "Greek pictures of the first Russian princes, a collection in memory of the Great Prince Vladimir by lovers of ancient literature," Petrograd, 1917. "Frescoes in the Cathedral of St. Dmitri in Vladimir" by Igor Grabar.

C. F. L. ST. GEORGE.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

rites in Syria.

DEAR REVEREND FATHER,

In reply to the letter signed "K.F.E.W." asking for information concerning the Syrian monks of St. Benedict, a short historical sketch is, I think, necessary.

Already in the Patriarch Mar Michael Jarweh's time (†1800) a desire was felt for the religious life. Sharfeh was originally a monastery with a few monks. But this first attempt was fruitless.

A second attempt was more successful. Not far from Beirut, near Shbeniye, was the prosperous monastery of Mar Afraam Raghm, which gave to the Catholic Syrian Church several bishops and was governed by an hegumenos with the episcopal character. But the monks of this monastery were massacred by the Druses in 1860. Their corpses were unearthed and burned, the ashes thrown to the winds, what remained of the bodies was thrown into the torrent, and the library and monastery were burnt.

The monastery of Mar Behnam, near Mossul, dating from the fifth century and containing the body of the royal boy-martyr St. Behnam (fourth century) contains a few young students preparing for the monastic life, but it is languishing.

In the nineteenth century another attempt was made at Mardin and in Upper Mesopotamia by Mgr. Ephrem Ahmar-Dagno, chorepiscopus, who founded the monks of St. Ephrem. These were thirty in number till they were massacred or scattered by the war of 1914-1918. A few still survive and act as parish priests.

In 1899 the late Patriarch Mar Ignatios Ephrem II Rahmani asked the Benedictines to found a Syrian Seminary in Jerusalem. His request was met by the Benedictines of the French Province of the Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance. Pope Leo XIII said: "I love the Syrians. They have only one shortcoming: they have no religious life." At the same time the Patriarch Rahmani desired the formation of a Syrian Benedictine branch, and often repeated these words: "The Rule which came from the East must go back there."

In 1929 took place the election of the new Patriarch (now Cardinal) Mar Ignatios Ephrem I Tappuni. The Holy Synod of the Syrian episcopate, which decided the union of the two seminaries of Sharfeh and Jerusalem, urged Dom Anselm Chibas-Lassalle, Prior of the Monastery of Saints Benedict and Ephrem on the Mount of Olives (since 1934

also titular Abbot of Our Lady of the Valley of Josaphat), to make a Syrian monastic foundation as soon as possible.

In October, 1934, this desire began to be realised. A young Syrian priest, ordained in February of the same year, presented himself at the Mount of Olives, received the monastic habit and began his canonical novitiate. On November 1st, 1935, he took his three-yearly vows, *pronouncing the formula of Profession in Latin and Syriac*. Being at present alone in an entirely Latin community, in order to avoid singularity, he wears the Western Benedictine habit *outside liturgical functions*. *For all the rest, he has kept in their entirety the celebration of the Holy Liturgy and the Divine Office and the administration of the Sacraments according to the pure Antiochene rite, without either addition, suppression or change*. As for the costume, once a sufficiently large Syrian community will have been formed, *the ancient Syrian monastic habit will be revived*.

With regard to the attitude of the Jacobite clergy, the Rabban¹ of whom we speak has had the opportunity of speaking with the monks of St. Mark's in Jerusalem; and when the latter expressed their astonishment at seeing him in a Latin habit, he gave them the same explanation as that which we have given above. Consequently, the only Latinization consists in the habit, *and that is only temporary*.

The Rule of St. Benedict has been chosen precisely because St. Benedict was the most Eastern of Western monastic legislators. It is intended to re-orientalize, so to speak, the Rule which drew its origins from the East; and a first step in this direction has already been taken by translating it into Syriac and Arabic. There is no intention of slavishly imitating the West; it is proposed to operate an adaptation which will safeguard the Syrian and Eastern character of the Antiochene rite. It has been found necessary to have recourse to a Western Order, because in the Catholic Syrian Church, on account of unhappy circumstances, the native monastic tradition has been lost and the present state of the monastic life among the Jacobites is far from corresponding to the ideal aimed at.

The future Syrian Benedictine monastery will be what St. Benedict in the Prologue to the Holy Rule, intends his monastery to be, "*Dominici schola servitii*," where the full Christian life will be lived in community and the monks' principal occupation will be the daily celebration of the conventual Eucharistic Liturgy and Choir Office. The

¹ "Rabban" (lit. "our master") is the Syriac word used to designate a monk with the priestly character, and corresponds to *ιερομόναχος* among the Byzantines. It is to be noted that the proportion of priest-monks is much larger among the Jacobites than among the Orthodox.

Syrian monks will also undertake, according to the needs of the Church and the desire of the Hierarchy, apostolic work ; but this apostolic work (seminaries, schools, ministerial work, publications, etc.), will be done by and in the community, so that those engaged therein will be able to continue their normal liturgical and monastic life. For this reason monks will not serve as parish priests. Both manual and intellectual labours will be practised, and special attention will be given to those branches of study which concern Syriac Patrology and the Antiochene Liturgy. The principal and most immediate aim of the monks' apostolic work will, of course, be the return of the Jacobites to the Church, and later, in God's good time, also the Missions, especially among the Moslems.

I think the above is sufficient to show that in the future Syro-Benedictine community the Antiochene dress, Liturgy and mentality will be scrupulously maintained in their entirety.

With regard to mentality among the Syrians, both Catholic and dissident, one should be on one's guard against making general statements and being influenced by the impressions of travellers before the War. That cataclysm, in bringing about the emigration of numerous Christian populations from the mountains of Tur 'Abdin, the plains of Mesopotamia or the mountains of Ciclia to the cities and towns of Syria and the Lebanon, inaugurated the birth and development of a new mentality which is not always praiseworthy. Among the dissidents, the hierarchy and monks are rigid and reactionary in order to support their own cause and on account of age-long prejudices against everything Western. With regard to the people, one must distinguish between those who inhabit the great urban centres, such as Aleppo, Damascus or Beirut, and those who live in the plains of Gezireh. The latter, both Catholics and Jacobites, still keep intact their ancient Syrian mentality ; whereas the Syrians of the cities, especially the Catholics, tend to divest themselves of their Syrian characteristics and to adopt Latin devotions out of snobbery. The Jacobites themselves are becoming detached, and some of them are drifting towards religious indifference or Protestantism, while others have a tendency to becoming Latin Catholics.

Yours truly,

D.B.M.

This reply of D.B.M. should fully satisfy K.F.E.W. and also our readers interested in the question. We here thank the writer and close the correspondence.—(Editor).

WHITHER ORTHODOXY ?

DEAR SIR,

Mr. Bowron in his article entitled " Whither Orthodoxy ? " in your last issue, attacks the Orthodox Church in respect of her relations with the Anglicans on three main points :

1. Misunderstanding by the Orthodox of Anglicanism, which, he says, is more Protestant than the Orthodox think ;
2. On the other hand, understanding of the meaning of " Union " to be total conversion to the " Byzantine " rite ;
3. Acceptance by some Orthodox Synods of Anglican Orders without any real study of the subject.

I reply :

1. It is true that it happens often that people cannot well understand other Christians, and even sometimes their own neighbours. But is it right to attack the Orthodox Church herself because she has among her children some who either are not sufficiently sensitive, or are ignorant when they speak about the non-Orthodox Christians ?

We believe that the whole (Orthodox) Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost cannot err, but if some of her children err, it does not imply at all that the Church errs too. The error is of the individuals.

" It is extremely difficult for foreigners," says Mr. Bowron, " to grasp our (English) mentality." And he explains it by an example : " A Catholic from abroad entering one of the Anglo-Catholic churches, very naturally takes it for granted that they have the same beliefs and practices concerning the Blessed Virgin, as he has himself. But when I tell him that Anglicans and even Anglo-Catholics have very little devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and that countless converts from Anglo-Catholicism will support me in saying that they had to become Catholics before they understood at all what this meant, he will hardly believe me."

The Editor makes a note : " Here we disagree with the writer ; what he says may be true of some Anglo-Catholics, but there are many others whose devotion to Our Lady is of real solid piety."

Both of them (the Author and the Editor) are Englishmen, and both are Roman Catholic. You can see easily how difficult it is for an individual to understand others (even of the same nation !) Therefore, neither the book of Mr. Demetrakopoulos

(which Mr. Bowron quotes) nor any other individual opinion is of any importance.

What is of real importance is the fact that, "ab omnibus, ubique, et semper," in the Orthodox Church the Anglican Christians were and are regarded with the greatest religious friendship. *This means that the Orthodox Catholic Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, feels in her common Catholic conscience that the Anglican Christians (especially those of the High Church party) are nearer to the Catholic Orthodox than many others.*

2. There are three different ideas of Christian Unity : unity of organization, unity of association, and unity of faith. The first is represented by the Roman Church, the second by the Anglicans, and the third by the Orthodox.

To the Orthodox, Unity means nothing else than : "let us kiss one another, that we may *with one mind* confess the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost" "and grant that *with one mouth and one heart* we may glorify and praise in song Thy most honourable and majestic Name"¹.

If there is not "one mind" *eo ipso* there is no unity ; there is no possibility therefore of having any "communio in sacris." And if there is still a strong desire to have this "communio," it may be achieved only through the conversion of the unorthodox to the orthodox belief. In that sense "reunion" is merely conversion.

But "Unity in faith" does not imply at all as necessary "conversion to the Byzantine rite" (and to the jurisdictional obedience), although this rite, as belonging to the *Orthodox* Church is in itself a source of a true devotional life and therefore considered by her children as the best. Any rite can be accepted to that fellowship if it does not contradict Orthodoxy. This principle is quite evident from many historical facts, and first of all from the establishment of the so-called "Edinoverzetskaya Tserkov" in Russia and from the talks with Old Catholics many years ago. Now the Orthodox Church has similar talks with the historical Christian Church of Malabar in India with which, it is hoped, there will be restored full inter-communion, though they will not change their ancient rites, or lose their system and autonomy in government.

¹ The Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom.

It is the Roman idea of Unity as total organizational uniformity (obedience to the Pope) which is a real obstacle to our reunion with Rome (and even more so doctrinally than practically), and which compels us to speak about the Uniates as the people "converted to Rome." "Uniatism," however it is interpreted, is a conversion, to our mind, and even (to be frank) an apostasy from Orthodox Catholicism, from the "Sobornost."

3. The validity of Anglican Ordinations? This is still to be decided by the Church.

There are some autocephalous Churches which have recognised it, and Mr. Bowron says this recognition was not based on any real historical study. To answer this it is enough to mention the following Orthodox studies on the subject:—

V. A. Sokolov, *The Hierarchy of the Anglican Church*. Sergio Posad, 1897. (Russian).

A. Bulgakov, *Concerning the Canonicity and Authenticity of the Anglican Hierarchy from the Orthodox standpoint*. Kiev, 1906. (Russian).

J. P. Sokolov, *On the Authenticity of the Anglican Hierarchy*. "Christian reading." Theological Academy of S. Petersburg year XCIII, 1902. p. 153. (Russian).

Nicolas Ambrazes, *Of the Reunion of the Anglican Episcopalians with the Orthodox Eastern Church*. Athens, 1891. (Greek).

Chrys. Androustos, *The Validity of Anglican Ordination from the standpoint of the Orthodox*. Constantinople, 1903. (Greek).

P. Komnenos, *Anglican Ordinations*. Constantinople, 1921. (Greek).

Chrysostomos Papadopoulos, Archbishop of Athens, *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*. Jerusalem, 1925. (Greek, translated into English by Canon J. A. Douglas. London, 1930).

After the reading of Mr. Bowron's article you may come to the conclusion that the Orthodox Church does not know herself what she is doing in her relations with the Anglicans; there is misunderstanding, no clear idea of what unity is, religious nationalism, insufficient learning on the question of the Anglican priesthood—in a few words, there is a great danger of the protestantization of the Orthodox East itself. Whither Orthodoxy?

I answer: Orthodoxy is the Wisdom of God,

His Revelation. The Orthodox Church is guided by the Holy Ghost; owing to Orthodoxy (the Divine Wisdom) the world itself exists! Therefore there is no danger.

The mission of the Orthodox Church is to bring the whole world into the way of salvation. This does not mean always conversion, or union. Sometimes it is only preaching and preparing for the real union in future. Sometimes it is even only the curing, the growing into fulness of the unorthodox. Many Anglicans are growing into that fulness; some are already completely Orthodox, having this inheritance from the earliest days of the "British Orthodox Church." The only difficulty is that they are communicating with the Protestant parties. But still they exist, and the Orthodox Catholic movement is growing in England. That is why the Orthodox Church considers it as desirable to have friendly relations with the Anglicans; and I am sure that if there were not such an aggressive Papalist attitude among the Roman Catholics, the same friendly relations would be established with them.

It is a very sad thing indeed that some children of the Orthodox Church are not sincere enough sometimes, or are themselves under the influence of Protestant thought and do not represent real Orthodoxy. But this is unavoidable for to be a son of the Orthodox Church does not imply, at the same time, sinlessness or infallibility.

But what about the Church?

Whither Orthodoxy?

To cure the World!

VLADIMIR RODZIANKO.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr Vladimir Rodzianko is a young Russian Orthodox theological student; he has studied in Jugoslavia as well as in an Anglican theological college; he is a disciple of the late Metropolitan Anthony. Having read Mr. Bowron's article in the last issue, he wrote (at our suggestion) his comments on the same. The comments were rather in the nature of a thesis. He began by stating that the Orthodox Church was the true means of salvation, and then went on to show the attitude of the Orthodox Church to those who are not strictly of her fold. Want of space has forced us (with his permission) to suppress this introduction. We have, however, retained what is most relevant to the subject and we are sure it will prove of interest.

Yet we must make two remarks. Catholics would most certainly maintain that the Church of Rome stands for unity of Faith whether or not her unity of organization is more obvious to an outsider. We do not think that there is such a great distinction in theory between the "Uniates" in communion with Rome and the historical Churches who seek full inter-communion with Orthodoxy.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΣΙΣ. *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome, Bishop and Martyr.* Edited by Dom Gregory Dix, monk of Nashdom Abbey. Volume I. Historical Introduction, Textual Materials and Translation, with *apparatus criticus* and some critical notes. Published for the Church Historical Society. (London: S.P.C.K. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937). pp. lxxxii+90 in 8vo.

The Anaphora, or Great Eucharistic Prayer. An eirenical study in Liturgical History by Walter Howard Frere, C.R., D.D., sometime Bishop of Truro. (Ib., id.). pp. vi+212 in 8vo.

The Saints of Egypt, by De Lacey O'Leary, D.D. (Lecturer at Bristol University, author of "Daily Office and Theotokia of the Coptic Church," "Coptic Theotokia," "Coptic Difuar," etc.). (Ib., id.). pp. viii+286 in 8vo.

These three works are numbers 24, 25 and 27 respectively of the excellent series edited by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The three have in common the priceless characteristic of being sound pieces of real scholarship, written with great ability and discrimination; indeed, they are, all three, valuable additions to the English studies on the Liturgy and positive Theology.

Dom Gregory Dix, monk of the Anglican Community of Nashdom Abbey, has specialised on the writings of St. Hippolytus of Rome, an illustrious martyr who had happened to be the first notorious antipope, but who repented before his martyrdom. St. Hippolytus's *Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition* certainly deserved to be made known in English garb; and Dom Dix has done it in pages 1 to 72 of his work, adding to the text abundant and most illuminating notes. More even than in these we have taken great pleasure in the General Introduction written by the learned Editor. The interesting life of St. Hippolytus is here told (pages xii-xxxv) with an unbiassed, open mind, guided only by historical facts. As an antipope, St. Hippolytus is not a hero to be admired; but rather, although "passionately sincere and high-minded in his own personal life," "clearly narrow, obstinate and quite unsympathetic in his dealings with others" (p. xv). As to "the representative value of the evidence of the Apostolic Tradition," the Editor's conclusions seem to us quite fitting: "it represents the mind and practice not of St. Hippolytus only but of the whole Catholic Church of the second century," and "as such it

is of outstanding importance" (p. xliv). To try to "find" more in St. Hippolytus's Treatise is both unhistorical and un-theological.

Bishop W. H. Frere calls his work on the Anaphora an "eirenical study" in Liturgical History, and on the main lines, it certainly deserves this sub-title. Only his Lordship has written the book with the evident aim of inviting the Churches in communion with Canterbury to reform their Eucharistic Canon on the lines of the Greek Anaphora, and this gives a certain bias to the whole study. However, on the whole, it is a valuable contribution to the history of the gradual development of the Canon both in the Eastern and Western Churches; and as such it can be heartily recommended to all theologians and liturgiologists. The history of the Anaphora naturally includes that of the Epiclesis, whose controversial aspect is discussed by Bishop Frere in the XVII chapter of his book (pp. 181-194). After reading it several times there is one fact which has strongly impressed the present reviewer, namely, that the importance of the Epiclesis has been exaggerated by modern theologians—especially non-Catholic and non-Roman Latin theologians—for controversial purposes. When one remembers the endless quarrels provoked by the *Filioque* among the Greeks, one cannot but conclude that there is a perfect agreement as regards the essentials of the Consecration among Greeks and Latins. May we end with one query: did the early reformers believe in the *Real Presence* or rather in the *Real Absence* of Our Lord in the Eucharist, and did they ever consider this as a true Sacrifice?

The Saints of Egypt, by Dr. De Lacey O'Leary is an exhaustive hagiological study, deserving of all praise. In the first part the author gives us a synthetical history of the Church in Egypt, chiefly, of course, at Alexandria. He deals, moreover, with the Coptic language and its liturgical use, with the Egyptian martyrs and monasticism—a fascinating subject of absorbing interest—and with the sources for the subject-matter of the book. The second part is wholly devoted to short but very comprehensive notices of all the Egyptian saints, in alphabetical order. Henceforth no writer on hagiology can ignore this book which has most conveniently filled a gap in English hagiological literature.

As a Benedictine, the present reviewer cannot but gratefully and proudly—the pride, of course, of *fraterna devotio*—remark the fact that in the three books here reviewed, the names of present-day Benedictine scholars are mentioned almost in every page among the best writers on liturgical and patristic studies. Namely, those of Dom H. Connolly and Abbot

Butler of Downside: Dom Ferotin and Abbot Cabrol of Farnborough; Dom Morin of Maredsous; Dom Cagin of Solesmes; Dom G. Prado of Silos, and several others. *Multiplicentur numero, crescantque merito!*

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

Theophanes Nicaenus, Sermo in Sanctissimam Deiparam, edited by M. Jugie, A.A., *Lateranum*, nova series, I, 1, Rome, 1935.

It is certainly characteristic of the irenic dispositions prevailing in the West towards the separated Churches of the East, that more and more of their precious documents are studied and published not by Easterns but by Latins. Père Jugie in particular has a right to the gratitude still more of the Greeks than of the Latins by his incessant labours to unveil the beauties of a once living tradition. The publication of this discourse of Theophanes of Nicea is a very important contribution to Mariology. Theophanes belonged to the school of Gregorios Palamas, but it would be difficult to make his dogmatic treatment of Our Lady depend in any way upon Palamite theology. In the East as in the West the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were marked by an extraordinary development of religious thought. As in the West there were St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus and many others, so there were in the East Nikephoros Blemmydes (d. c. 1272), Johannes Bekkos (d. 1293), Gregorios Akindynos (the translator of many passages of St. Thomas' *Summa contra Gentiles*), Gregorios Palamas, Nikolaos Kabasilas, our Theophanes and many contributors to the Palamite controversy. In this almost sudden expansion of intellectual life the discourse of Theophanes stands out for its positivity and genuine theological depth.

Of Theophanes we know very little. He must have been made bishop of Nicea between 1366 and 1369 (though he bears the title also of exarch of all Bithynia), was a friend of Johannes VI Kantakuzenos (d. 1383), and died in 1381.

The present work was not inspired by controversy but meant by the author as a tribute of filial homage paid to the Theotokos for the many graces she had bestowed upon him. The work is wholly based on the Mystery of the Incarnation as the centre and the all-embracing perfection of the whole creation. Whereas most books on Our Lady mostly treat of her from a psychological point of view, laying almost all the stress on Her dispositions when pronouncing the Fiat, on her personal virtuous life, on her merits, Theophanes transfers the whole Mystery of Our Lady to the ontological level. Since for him the Incarnation is the central fact on

which the whole reality of the creation at large is hinged, and since Our Lady contributed together with God to bringing about this Incarnation, it follows that the whole created reality depends *ipso facto* and universally not only on God but also on Our Lady. Theophanes has therefore not the slightest scruple in attributing to Our Lady not only all graces without exception where man is concerned, but even the salvation and beatification of the Spirits in Heaven. Though P. Jugie may be right in his suspicion that Theophanes attributes the beatific vision to the Angels only after the Incarnation, yet one may suggest that, having put the whole discussion on the ontological level, that is, the time and space transcending level, Theophanes simply maintains that the beatific vision of the angels is ontologically dependent on the Incarnation. This makes the dependence not less real and would not seem to imply either a philosophical or a theological error. With P. Jugie every one who reads this discourse will feel the relief of getting away from the psychological and rhetorical platitudes that fill most books on Our Lady. To understand a grand Lady one has to think in grand style.

T.W.

Guide du Musée Byzantin D'Athènes, avec avant-propos sur la sculpture et sur la peinture Byzantines en Grèce. G. Sotirion, Directeur du Musée. Edition Française par O. Merlier. 91 photographic illustrations. Athens, 1932. No price.

"The Byzantine Museum at Athens is destined to become the Greek National Museum *par excellence*, as its object is to illustrate the development of art as it evolved within the domain of Hellenism from the end of the classical period to the time when Greece freed herself from the Turkish yoke; that is, from the fourth century A.D. to the beginning of the nineteenth century—1830." (Preface).

The author points out that classical Greek art has acquired an international character, "but the Greek Christian works of art are nearer to us, they bear the stamp of our actual religion, and are characteristic of the ideas, habits and customs amongst which we still live.

"After all the pillagings and disasters which she has suffered, Greece is still covered with Byzantine monuments. What is found isolated and detached from its setting in the Museum, can be seen in its proper place, often intact and in use in the church. It is only there, in its setting, that the great Byzantine art and the influence which it exerts can be realised and appreciated. Yet examples of the different epochs and diverse branches of Byzantine art can be seen in the Museum, which allows of detailed study by any who wish to undertake it."

Short of the creation of a like museum in Constantinople itself, as successfully collected, planned and catalogued—and for this materials already exist—the Athens museum is as good a summary as one could find of true Byzantine art. One realises how much more powerful and healthy it is than its provincial derivatives. The works contained come from a wide area, but yet belong to the main Byzantine stream, with few exceptions, such as some Coptic eikons.

The Byzantine Museum was created in 1914, and some time later installed in the house of the Duchesse de Plaisance and its dependencies. This house was built in 1848 by a Greek architect in the style of a small Florentine palace. It is a white building of simple and pleasant appearance, with the Hymettos hills standing up behind it and, in front, Lykabettos. The interior has been arranged so that the objects, especially the sculpture, should have their proper setting; thus three rooms have been arranged as a paleo-Christian basilica of the simplest type, as a cruciform Byzantine church with a cupola, and as a post-Byzantine church with a single nave (all illustrated). The structural incorporation of which this allows is a very intelligent advance in museum-planning.

The Guide's numerous illustrations are well printed and the text contains much interesting information, but it is not an easy book of reference, as the objects are arranged according to their present position on the walls and not in numerical order. Thus to find the description of an object illustrated requires some search. The book is priced low.

E.J.B.F.

The Eastern Branches of the Catholic Church. Six studies compiled by the Liturgical Arts Society. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1938). pp. 110.

This is a reprint of a special number of *Liturgical Arts* that first appeared in 1935. That Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. should consider the subject of sufficient importance to publish it in book form shows that there is an increasing demand on the part of the Catholic public to know more about the Eastern Churches.

In his introduction Mr. Attwater very rightly draws particular attention to the article of Father John LaFarge, S.J., on "Liturgy and Asceticism in the Eastern Church." It is a most valuable setting forth of the *mentality* of the Christian East, a thing that it is most important for us to understand while at the same time realizing that it is as Catholic as the mentality of the Roman Church.

Father O'Hara's article dealing with the more striking disciplinary differences between the Oriental and the Latin

Churches is a very useful and necessary comment on the Code of Canon Law.

The articles of Dom Dirks on eikons, and of Cardinal Tisserant on the Ethiopic Church are of special interest.

There is at the end of the book a very excellent list of books, periodicals and pamphlets introductory to a study of the Eastern Churches.

B.W.

Anakephalaiosis: La Récapitulation. By A. M. van der Mensbrugghe. (Published for the author at Cour du Prince 55, Gand, Belgium). pp. 128. 12 fr. belg.

In this little book is given an exposition of the means of salvation available to pagans since the coming of Christ, with, as a sort of corollary, a section on the necessity of supporting the Church's missionary endeavours. Though in parts the development of the author's argument is a little difficult to follow, there are here and there passages of great ability and interest. The text is marred by numerous misprints, and would be much easier to follow had a consistent use of capitals, italics, inverted commas, and the like, been maintained throughout. In spite of these defects, however, the book will have a definite interest and value for those concerned with missionary work to pagan lands.

R.G.J.

Roumanian Journey. Sacheverell Sitwell. (Batsford, 1938). 8s. 6d.

Roumanian music and gipsy music, Roumanian food, Roumanian clothes, the seven El Grecos of the royal collection, the lazy swamps of the Danube delta, the "painted churches" of Bucovina, like the bejewelled heavenly Jerusalem set down in the midst of snow and forest: these are the impressions of Sacheverell Sitwell's book. Here he is at home, appreciating the unspoiled peasant stock, almost bringing the music to one's ears, creating an atmospheric impression of scenery, comparing, estimating, putting in their setting the works of art, with all the wide reference of a travelled dilettante. Between whiles one is perhaps too aware of the introductory acknowledgment to the "Guide Bleu," though this may be inevitable after a journey of only four weeks' duration: there must be some "padding," points where it is an effort to find something to say. Certain tricks of style do not facilitate easy reading; such are the constant repetition of certain favourite and less familiar adjectives—"bucolic" comes immediately to mind—and the frequent omission of the definite article before a genitive—"Valcov exists in midst of a forest of willow groves."

The book is generous in full-page illustrations—there must be as many pages of photographs as of text. They form a considerable portion of the interest of the book. There are a great number of photographs of peasants in their elaborate costumes, some fine landscapes, the Bucovina churches, their exteriors painted as with serried ranks of eikons—one, we are told, predominantly the blue of its lapis lazuli, another predominantly rose: he has much of interest to say on the artistic conceptions of lesser Byzantine work—the charming Orthodox convents of Hurez and Cozia with their almost more charming inhabitants, the churches of Jassy and Curtea de Arges, a fine photograph of the “Little Entrance” of the Byzantine liturgy, the long-haired Laetzi gipsies, the modern buildings of Bucarest, the Skapetz cabmen, and the monks of the strange, poor monastery of Petropavlosk.

These Russian sects which are found along the border of Roumania are discussed with some interest: the continual bye-products, so to speak, of the Orthodox church in Russia, they have at various times been cast out of her borders, and for that very reason escape the persecution from which the Orthodox Church itself now suffers. Mr. Sitwell is interested in the Scapetz cabmen of Bucarest and certain other places, a sect which practises castration, and he gives a moving account of the extreme poverty and the holiness of Petropavlosk, a monastery, in the Danube delta, of “Old Believers,” whose origin and characteristics were described by Mr. St. George in the last issue of this Quarterly. The author also makes a passing reference to the “priestless” Old Believers.

This is a book to attract one to Roumania.

E.J.B.F.

Scito Cur: Latin Moods and Tenses in Theory and Practice.

By E. L. Willems, O.S.B., D.Ph. et L. (Lovan.). (The Monastery Press, Ramsgate). pp. 222. 7s. 6d.

This extremely able exposition of Latin Syntax should be of the greatest value to the higher forms of schools and in particular to those whose business it is to teach the Latin language to others. It would be difficult to think out a clear or more logical explanation of a difficult and complicated subject, an explanation, moreover, whose practical value is greatly enhanced by the many pages of well-chosen examples given in the second section of the book.

R.G.J.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London: *Symbolism and Belief*: Edwyn Bevan.

S.P.C.K.: *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought*: Nadejda Gorodetzky.

